

**Positioning the Author:
Four Writers in the Field
of Cultural Production,
1880-1900**

Isla L. Jack

Submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy.
University of Edinburgh, 1998.



DECLARATION

I declare that the contents and the composition of this thesis are my own work

Isla L. Jack

ABSTRACT

Using terms and ideas from Pierre Bourdieu's theories of cultural production, this thesis reconsiders the positions of four authors functioning at the end of the nineteenth century. Therefore, a brief introduction presents the principles behind Bourdieu's work.

The reconstruction of the field is begun in the first chapter, 'Towards a Democratic Culture: A Redefining Voice of the 1890s'. It reveals the literary field to be the site of a struggle to impose the legitimate definition of literature and investigates some of the new voices entering the conflict in the 1890s. Considering the development of the literary biography, the literary manual, literary tourism and the appearance of the 'celebrity' author, it points towards the conflict at the heart of the field which centres around opposing principles of valuation.

In Chapter Two, 'Internal Conflict: George Gissing and *New Grub Street*', the reconstruction of the field is continued through a re-positioning of Gissing within the social and cultural networks of his time. It considers in more detail the opposing principles of legitimacy underlying the issue of definition, through a new reading of the novel which introduces the conflict between the sub-fields of large-scale and restricted production.

Chapter Three, '“Collective Misrecognition”: Walter Besant and Henry James' concentrates on the dual economy necessitated by the differing systems of valuation adopted in each sub-field, revealing the problems encountered in a field which deals in both symbolic and economic capital. The field of Besant and James is reconstructed initially through their contributions to 'The Art of Fiction' debate. The writing, action and fortunes of Besant and James are then reappraised in order to position them within this dual economy, and question their status as representatives of the commercialisation of art and indifferent aestheticism, respectively.

Finally, the sub-field of large scale production is considered in greater detail in Chapter Four, 'The Sub-Field of Large-Scale Production: J. M. Barrie, *New Journalism* and *Sentimental Tommy*'. Barrie's position as a popular writer is explored within the context of the arrival of the new journalist, using examples from his own early journalism before turning to *Sentimental Tommy*. The new reading argues that the novel is a product of Barrie's participation within the conflicts of the field. Conscious of his own entrapment in the field, Barrie uses the text to define himself against the extremes of both sub-fields.

An appendix repositioning James Joyce carries the argument into the twentieth century.

In conclusion, this thesis seeks to uncover the conflicts within which the four authors considered functioned. Uncovering a field which sustained both a growth in autonomy and democratisation, it reveals writers at this time moving, albeit in different ways and with varying degrees of insight, towards greater awareness of their own positions within the conflict between 'commercial' and 'non-commercial' upon which the field of cultural production is structured.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people are responsible for the completion of this thesis, on a variety of levels. Predominantly, I am indebted to Dr. W. R. Bell, whose continual guidance and support were fundamental to my studies in Edinburgh. His help in the realisation of this work cannot be overestimated. Academically, I would also like to thank Prof. I. Campbell, who was there at the end and my dad for always being on hand to answer my interminable questions.

I am grateful to the staff at the Beinecke Library, Yale, Edinburgh University Library, the National Library for Scotland, and especially at Edinburgh Central Library, for locating and providing the periodicals and manuscripts used in my research. Individual thanks must also go to Dominic for his help in accessing the illustrations.

Personally, I would like to thank my mum, dad and sister, not only for their essential monetary investment in me, but for all their help and encouragement throughout. Finally, I wish all my friends, whose unwavering understanding, moral support and ability to make me laugh kept me going, to know that my appreciation of you is not just great, but eternal.

Naturally, any mistakes within this thesis are all my own, reflecting badly on none of the those who kept their faith in me, but its very existence is my small testament to them.

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
<i>List of Illustrations and Abbreviations</i>	1
INTRODUCTION	2
CHAPTER ONE: Towards a Culture of Democracy: A Redefining Voice of the 1890s	10
- The Literary Manual	17
- The Critical Biography	21
- Literary Tourism: The Cult of the Author	31
- The 'Celebrity' Author	36
CHAPTER TWO: Internal Conflict: George Gissing and <i>New Grub Street</i>	47
- Re-positioning George Gissing	50
- <i>New Grub Street</i> : Gissing's Diagnosis of the Literary Field	63
- <i>New Grub Street</i> : Inherited Conflicts	87
CHAPTER THREE: 'Collective Misrecognition': Walter Besant and Henry James	108
- 'The Art of Fiction' Debate	111
- The Making of Walter Besant	122
- The Creation of Henry James	136
CHAPTER FOUR: The Sub-Field of Large-Scale Production: J. M. Barrie, New Journalism and <i>Sentimental Tommy</i>	162
- 'Barrie is a beauty [. . .]. Genius in him, but there's a journalist at his elbow - there's the risk.'	168
- Barrie, <i>Scribner's</i> and the Critics	179
- 'Tommy [. . .] and the saying about art for art's sake.'	190
CONCLUSION	217
<i>Appendix: Notes Towards a Positioning of James Joyce</i>	222
<i>Bibliography</i>	250

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

	<i>Page</i>
<i>Figure 1</i> : Title-page to the first edition of <i>New Grub Street</i> (London: Smith, Elder, 1891).	95
<i>Figure 2</i> : 'Bob fell in love with him on the spot and chucked him under the chin': Illustration from the serialisation of <i>Sentimental Tommy</i> , taken from <i>Scribner's Magazine</i> , 19 (1896), [p.15].	183

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Full citations are provided in the first instance.

Auto: *The Autobiography of Walter Besant*

Essays: *Essays and Historiettes*

Field: *Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*

HJL: *Henry James Letters, III.*

NGS: *New Grub Street*

Pen: *The Pen and the Book*

Rules: *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*

ST: *Sentimental Tommy*

INTRODUCTION

The application of Pierre Bourdieu's theory in literary studies is in its infancy.¹ This thesis uses some of the terms and ideas from Bourdieu's theories of cultural production to reconsider the positions of four authors functioning at the end of the nineteenth century. Consequently, a brief introduction concerning Bourdieu and his theory in general will be helpful.²

Pierre Bourdieu has been described by critics as one of the most 'eminent contemporary French sociologists' with one of the most 'fertile and influential voices in recent French social theory', while his work has been defined as a 'prodigious and promising theoretical and empirical enterprise'.³ He first gained repute through the work he published in the 1960s on Algerian peasants in his capacity as an anthropologist. From there he has extended his research into the education and culture of France from a sociological standpoint. Aspects of culture which he has addressed range from artistic tastes, including photography as well as painting, to clothing and the use of language. However, such wide-ranging subject matter does not suggest lack of a definite objective. As Pekka Sulkenen explains the 'same themes keep returning to his texts'.⁴

Bourdieu's interest lies in highlighting conflict which has hitherto passed unnoticed in the social system. Paul DiMaggio describes Bourdieu's subject as being 'the ways of perceiving reality that are taken for granted by members of a social class or a society'.⁵ In every sphere of social interaction there lies a struggle between the participants for power. Bourdieu's problematic 'consists in revealing and bringing to light [these] hidden forms of domination that are consciously and unconsciously reproduced in everyday life'.⁶ To explicate his theory Bourdieu divides society into 'fields'.

Each field, in Bourdieu's terms, 'is a separate social universe having its own laws of functioning independent of those of politics and the economy', except

necessarily the economic and political fields.⁷ Accordingly, there are religious, scientific and literary fields which each encompass every participant in that particular area and the structural as well as the interactive relationships among them. These relationships produce what Randal Johnson highlights as the 'one universal invariant property of fields' - competition.⁸ The competition, or conflict, between members of the field need not be, and in many cases is not, consciously undertaken. The essence of the struggle is to gain power and, thus, a dominant position in the field.

Power can be gained by an accumulation of capital which, importantly for Bourdieu and the functioning of the fields, need not be economic. DiMaggio summarises this aspect of Bourdieu's theory:

Capital, defined implicitly as attributes, possessions, or qualities of a person or a position exchangeable for goods, services, or esteem, exists in many forms - symbolic, cultural, social or linguistic, as well as economic. Throughout his writing, Bourdieu tries to develop an economics of symbolic exchange and of the transformations of the different kinds of capital into one another.⁹

In the field of literature the fact that both symbolic and economic capital can be acquired is of particular importance. It allows for two economies to function within the literary field, accounting for its division into two main sub-fields; the field of large-scale production which submits to the laws of competition and deals in economic capital, and the field of restricted production which 'tends to develop its own criteria for the evaluation of its products' (*Field*, p. 115). This system of exchange underlines the opposition within the literary field between 'creative liberty and the laws of the market' (*Field*, p. 127).

Another key image in Bourdieu's theory is the *habitus*. Randal Johnson describes Bourdieu's conception of the *habitus* as a 'feel for the game' that 'inclines agents to act and react in specific situations in a manner which is not simply a question of conscious obedience to rules. Rather it is a set of dispositions which

generates practices and perceptions'.¹⁰ The habitus combines the influence of external social structures and internal personal disposition, or as Sulkenen suggests, 'the subjective and the culturally determined elements'.¹¹ He uses an example from Bourdieu's cultural studies to expand:

Lower class people do not prefer Rafaello to Picasso because there is a norm saying they should. They simply like Rafaello and do not like Picasso. What this preference means and how it has been generated is a matter of habitus - it is for the researcher to find out. But this preference is an active choice. There is a cultural code that defines a symbolic value to cultural practices - going to certain museums for example - and the habitus of each group or class is formed in the practical choice of utilizing these values, defining oneself in terms of them and expressing one's self-definition by attachment to certain specific artistic genres (or life-styles).¹²

As a sociologist Bourdieu is interested in discovering why different sections of society confer different symbolic values on, in this instance, aesthetic objects. There is no external force dictating that the lower-class should pass over Picasso in favour of Rafaello, but his research has shown that this is the case.

The construction of the habitus indicates another concern of Bourdieu's, and it is one which allows him to stand apart from many sociologists. He wishes to 'transcend' the opposition which pits objectivism against subjectivism by objectifying the subjective. He sees the advantages of each method of approach, but also the danger involved in following one to the exclusion of the other. As a result Bourdieu's theory can be seen as eclectic. The names most often connected with, or thought to influence, his theory are Weber, Durkheim and Marx.¹³ Questioned on his ability to construct one single science from such diverse sources, Bourdieu argued that such 'communication between opposing theories, which have often been constituted against each other' needed to be established, 'to enable science to progress'.¹⁴

To bring the argument into the literary field, Bourdieu rejects the Russian Formalists and Structuralists, along with the Marxist critics as inadequate. Each

literary theory which has gone before does not take into account the whole field of cultural production. Both internal and external modes of analysis are deficient in themselves, and therefore Bourdieu's theory of the cultural field seeks to transcend them.¹⁵ Johnson explains the unique way in which the theory aims to accomplish this:

It takes into consideration not only the works themselves, seen relationally within the space of available possibilities and within the historical development of such possibilities, but also producers of the work in terms of their strategies and trajectories, based on their individual and class habitus, as well as their objective position within the field. It also entails an analysis of the structure of the field itself, which includes the positions occupied by the producers (e.g. writers, artists) as well as those occupied by all instances of consecration and legitimation which make cultural goods what they are (the public, publishers, critics, galleries, academies and so forth).¹⁶

Therefore, Bourdieu is not only concerned with the interaction of participants in the field, but with the structures which define them. He contends that 'to understand [. . .] any writer, major or minor, is first of all to understand what the status of writer consists of at the moment considered' (*Field*, p. 163). This entails a consideration of the conflicting principles of legitimacy, and their levels of domination, as they existed within the literary field at that specific time.

Bourdieu uses his theory to produce a 'rigorous science of cultural works' designed to define the genesis and structure 'of the specific social space in which the "creative project" was formed' (*Field*, p. 192 & 193). It involves a threefold process. First, the position of the literary field within the field of power at the time needs to be analysed. Then, the objective relations between the positions in competition at that moment, and the genesis of the different producers' habitus both require reconstructing. My thesis does not share the sociological objectives of Bourdieu; rather, by focusing primarily on reconstructing the field in which writers were working, and thus the principles upon which their value was produced, it offers new readings of the works of literature which they produced.

In terms of the social theory outlined above the ideological idea of author as the sole creator of a work is dead. The focus of this work, nevertheless, is the position of the author as he is affected by the other positions in the field, and their writing as manifestations of this objectively defined position. It is these other position-holders who define the value of each individual work within the structured field and allow the status, or value, of a writer to constantly change, relying as it does on the dominant opinion held in the field at a particular time. Within the following chapters the field of the 1890s will be reconstructed to give a new framework within which to read writing on authorship created within that period.

I have chosen the 1890s for two specific reasons. First, as a result of its construction whenever a new literary group enters the field the whole system is transformed. The 1890s saw the entrance of two ideologically opposed groups, the New Journalists and the Decadents. Second, the field of literary production is a universe of belief formed around a legitimacy conflict. Bourdieu explains:

In other words the field of cultural production is the site of struggles in which what is at stake is the power to impose the dominant definition of the writer and therefore to delimit the population of those entitled to take part in the struggle to define the writer. The established definition of the writer may be radically transformed by an enlargement of the set of people who have a legitimate voice in literary matters.

(*Field*, p. 42)

The last decades of the nineteenth century saw an increase in readership and the start of a new kind of mass publication both of which contributed to an increase in the literary field on a scale hitherto unseen. How would this increase in those seeking to define the author, affect the authors themselves?

The following chapters seek to both introduce and use Bourdieu's theories of cultural production to reconsider some authors functioning within the field in the 1890s, a time of growing autonomy. Each chapter explores a specific aspect of the

field within a discussion of the writers and their work using Bourdieu's theory. Therefore, as an introduction to the structures defining authors and their value, Chapter One: 'Towards a Democratic Culture: A Redefining Voice of the 1890s' considers the struggle to impose the legitimate definition of art and literature as the 'issue at a stake' in the literary field. It reflects upon some of the new voices entering the conflict of definition in the 1890s as a result of further democratisation and expansion within the field. Furthermore, it considers the development of a canon aimed at a new kind of reader and addresses the new 'celebrity' status of the writer as a method of reconstructing the general tensions and values surrounding writers at that time.

In Chapter Two: 'Structural Divisions: George Gissing and *New Grub Street*', the reconstruction of the field is continued through a re-positioning of Gissing within the social and cultural networks of his time. It also discusses in greater detail the two rival principles of legitimacy which underlie the issue of definition explored in the opening chapter. It introduces the conflict between the sub-fields of large-scale and restricted production as one of the oppositions upon which the field is structured through a reconsideration of the novel as a product of that conflict.

The dual economy which is necessitated by the differing systems of valuation adopted in each sub-field is discussed in Chapter Three: '“Collective Misrecognition”: Walter Besant and Henry James'. The field of Besant and James is reconstructed initially through a consideration of their contributions to the 'Art of Fiction' debate. The writing, actions and fortunes of each author are then reappraised in order to position them within this dual economy, and to question their status as representatives of the commercialisation of art and indifferent aestheticism, respectively.

Finally the sub-field of large-scale production is considered through the work of J. M. Barrie in Chapter Four: 'The Sub-Field of Large-Scale Production: J. M. Barrie, New Journalism and *Sentimental Tommy*'. Barrie's position as a popular

writer is explored within the context of the arrival of the new journalist, using examples of his own journalism before turning to his novel. The new reading argues that *Sentimental Tommy* is a product of Barrie's participation within the conflicts of the field. Conscious of his own entrapment in the the field, Barrie uses the text to define himself against the extremes of both sub-fields.

Two publications are used as the main sources for Bourdieu's theories of cultural production in this thesis. The first is Randal Johnson's anthology of Bourdieu's essays on art and literature, *The Field of Cultural Production (Field)* (1993), a text which includes essays published between 1968 and 1987, some appearing in English for the first time, and a series of three lectures presented at Princeton University in 1986, hitherto unpublished. Johnson's selection is substantiated by Bourdieu's own compilation of his theories regarding literature and art published in 1992, appearing in English translation as *The Rules of Art (Rules)* (1996). Covering much of the same material as the *Field*, it combines, in one volume, the principles introduced in his earlier work with his most recent ideas.¹⁷ Taken together I have accepted these two volumes as being justifiably representative of Bourdieu's theory with regard to art and literature. I have not employed his theory as a strict code of conduct throughout this thesis but do not feel that the neglect of some aspects and expansion of others has created a distortion of his work. The very essence of the theory is that any claim to legitimise is only one in a long list of positions vying for that right.

Endnotes: Introduction

¹ The only in-depth work concerning literature and the theories of Bourdieu is Peter D. McDonald, *British Literary Culture and Publishing Practice, 1880-1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997). Bridget Fowler has considered Bourdieu's cultural theory from the sociological viewpoint in, *Pierre Bourdieu and Cultural Theory: Critical Investigations* (London: SAGE Publications, 1997). She is concerned with the problems raised by Bourdieu's theory in terms of class and feminist issues.

² See Fowler, pp. 13-42 where she 'situates' Bourdieu using brief synopses of some of his work.

³ Pekka Sulkunen, 'Society Made Visible - on the Cultural Sociology of Pierre Bourdieu', *Acta Sociologica*, 25 (1982), 103-15 (p. 103); Rogers Brubaker, 'Rethinking Classical Theory: The Sociological Vision of Pierre Bourdieu', *Theory and Society*, 14 (1985), 745-775 (p. 745); Paul DiMaggio, 'Review Essay: On Pierre Bourdieu', *American Journal of Sociology*, 84 (1978-9), 1460-74 (p. 1460).

⁴ Sulkunen, p. 105.

⁵ DiMaggio, p. 1461.

⁶ Sulkunen, p. 105.

⁷ Pierre Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*, ed. by Randal Johnson (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1993), p. 162. Further references to this text are given after quotations in the text, marked *Field*. It is Randal Johnson who points out that the obvious exceptions to this lie in the political and economic fields. Randal Johnson's introduction to Bourdieu, *The Field*, 1-25 (p. 6).

⁸ Johnson, p. 7.

⁹ DiMaggio, p. 1463.

¹⁰ Johnson, p. 5.

¹¹ Sulkunen, p. 103.

¹² Sulkunen, p. 108. See Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, trans. by Richard Nice (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1986), p. 263. Bourdieu had analysed people with varying amounts of economic and cultural capital concerning their preferences. As well as their opinions on art, he asked them about qualities in a friend, furniture and knowledge of composers.

¹³ Brubaker, p. 747-9; DiMaggio, p. 1469, DiMaggio also names Freud, Bernstein, and Goffman.

¹⁴ Taken from an interview with Pierre Thuillier, *La Recherche*, 112 (1980), 738-43, republished in Pierre Bourdieu, *Sociology in Question* (London: SAGE Publications, 1993), p. 11-2.

¹⁵ See Johnson in *Field*, p. 9-14 for a more detailed analysis of Bourdieu's place amongst literary theorists.

¹⁶ Johnson, p. 9.

¹⁷ Bourdieu, *Field*; Bourdieu, Pierre, *The Rules of Art, Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*, trans. by Susan Emanuel (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996). In *Rules* Bourdieu also takes the opportunity to re-write the work undertaken for the lectures given at Princeton. It seems that both Randal Johnson and Pierre Bourdieu realised the need for all his work on the subject of art and literature to be collected in one accessible volume.

CHAPTER ONE

Towards a Culture of Democracy: A Redefining Voice of the 1890s

The field of cultural production is the site of the struggles in which what is at stake is the power to impose the dominant definition of the writer and therefore to delimit the population of those entitled to take part in the struggle to define the author.

Pierre Bourdieu¹

By the end of the nineteenth century it was already clear that the process of defining an author was a complicated one. Since 1883 Walter Besant and the Society of Authors had been addressing the inadequacies of the last Copyright Act (1842) which, rather than clarifying, further clouded the issue.² They were fighting for the maintenance, definition and defence of literary property, the consolidation and amendment of the laws of domestic copyright, and the promotion of international copyright. Besant and the Society's attempt to interpret legal definitions of the author was, however, only one of the many defining voices in the 1890s.

In his article 'What is an Author?', in *The Juridical Review* for 1900, Alexander Moffat was to question the terms used in English Copyright Law. Remarking on the entire absence of 'accurate language', Moffat cited references to 'an "author" of a picture or a photograph, and the "publication" of a piece of sculpture' within the statutes.³ Taking as an example a controversy which had erupted concerning the precise definition of the word 'book' and whether or not a newspaper should be

categorised as such, he argued that debate continued to be fuelled by the 'sometimes startling' phraseology used (p. 218). As evidence, he considered the ambiguous position of the journalist and the newspaper within these laws and the case of *Walter v. Lane (a)*, specifically; a case which involved 'the interpretation of another undefined word in the Act, the word *Author*' (p. 220).

The *Walter v. Lane* case centred around the authorship of a press report of a public speech. Lane was the defendant who had published a collection of *Appreciations and Speeches of Lord Rosebery* in which four of the articles were exact replicas of earlier reports of the speeches as published in *The Times*. However, it was not Lord Rosebery who claimed the copyright, and thus the authorship, of his speeches, but the proprietors of *The Times*, as assignees of the reporter. Initially, the case was won by the plaintiff, it was then overturned by the Court of Appeal, only for the House of Lords finally to re-instate the first ruling. Therefore, Moffat reasons that in 1900, it was 'declared in law that a person who writes down what another person says, and prints it, is the "author" of the matter thus printed' (p. 221). The problem was that the Copyright Act of 1842 made no mention of printers or publishers and accordingly allowed for no other person except the 'author' to have copyright. Equally the speech could not come under the term 'book', the other basis of copyright, because it was transmitted orally.

Agreeing with Lord Robertson, who had defended the Court of Appeal's decision in the House of Lords, Moffat finds the conclusion reached by the House of Lords disturbing. Robertson explained that he:

fail[ed] entirely to see how in the widest sense of the word 'author' we are in the region of authorship [. . .]. When it is remembered that there is no manner of composition, as the term is generally used, even in the sense of arrangement by a shorthand reporter, I find it difficult to understand what attributes of an author belong to him.

(p. 224)

On this occasion copyright had been granted to the newspaper on account of the reporter's 'labour, skill and expense' rather than any originality or composition (p. 230). The ruling had effectively decreed that a speaker had no claim of copyright over an original, yet publicly delivered, speech but that any reporter of that speech did. Furthermore, Moffat highlights it as the first scenario in which 'the dignity of authorship has been conferred upon one whose writing contains not a thought, not a phrase, not a syllable of his own' (p. 226). He blames this farcical situation on the laws concerning copyright, deeming them to be 'the worst drawn and most unintelligible in the statute book' (p. 217).

In 'What Was an Author?' (1987) Molly Nisbet also turns to the law in an attempt to achieve a definition of authorship. Interested in the struggle which the users of new technologies - photographs, records, films - underwent in order to gain the right to use the title 'author', Nisbet seeks a more reliable 'standard of measurement' of authorship than evidence given by authors themselves.⁴ Instead of such subjective, and this flawed, perceptions, she presents French Copyright Law as a more objective strategy for definition. She illustrates that these new producers had to 'devise justifications' to enter a cultural field as defined by law, because only once they had justified themselves as 'authors' could they command authorial privileges.⁵

Nisbet argues that the Copyright Law separates cultural and industrial labour and, consequently, establishes a 'cultural field' which differentiates 'authors' from industrial workers through the bestowal of certain rights. Thus, after 1793 in France 'authors were unlike other laborers: the law has given them some rights to their work: even as it moved through the economy, their work remained their property' (p. 235). Such rights were not automatically given, but had to be fought for.

Creators, as Nisbet recognises, have to battle to enter a legally constructed 'cultural field'. Unfortunately, entry into this field does not constitute an end to an

author's struggle. While Copyright Laws do distinguish 'authors' from other workers, they do not make qualitative distinctions. As Nisbet explains:

The law did not even try to draw lines between good and bad work in these media and it did not presume to erect criteria for aesthetic quality. Slipshod failures and drawn reproductions were covered by the same rights as the master piece [. . .]. The cultural field is broad, said the law. It covered kitsch, avant-garde, low, high, and middle brow work with equal justice. Authors were not necessarily artists.

(p. 233)

In other words, Copyright law creates a 'single field where standards [are] blurred' (p. 233). Therefore, after initially fulfilling the legal requirements needed to be deemed an author and being permitted to enter the 'cultural field', artists have to re-define yet further the terms of their authorship within that field. Consequently, artists are seen, explicitly and implicitly, asserting themselves, providing the 'insider's bias' on the author question which Nisbet dismisses as 'partial and insufficient' (p. 230). They need to prove themselves to be true artists, justifying their position within this field amongst all the mere 'authors'.

Such justifications or definitions constitute one of the key conflicts in Pierre Bourdieu's field of cultural production. This is the field in which legal 'authors' function, alongside publishers, critics and other producers of cultural value. Bourdieu refers to it as the '*arena par excellence* of struggles over job definition' (*Field*, p. 61-2). There is a 'legitimacy conflict' between participants 'struggling for a monopoly of the imposition of legitimate categories of perception and appreciation' (*Field*, p. 52; *Rules*, p. 157).⁶ Each position-holder wants to obtain the power of consecration: the power to define the artist. Furthermore, it is this battle to define the writer which produces the value of cultural works and thus the writer's status within the field. Bourdieu argues that the producer of the '*value of the work of art*' is not the artist but the field of production as a universe of belief which produces the work of art' (*Rules*, p. 229).

The sociology of art and literature [...] has to consider as contributing to production not only the direct producers of the work in its materiality (artist, writer, etc.) but also the producers of the meaning and the value of the work - critics, publishers, gallery directors and the whole set of agents whose combined efforts produce consumers capable of knowing and recognizing the work of art as such, in particular teachers (but also families, etc.).

(Field, p. 37)

It is this complex matrix which Bourdieu refers to as the 'field of cultural production', and of which Nisbet's 'cultural field' defined by law can be seen as only one aspect.

The field of cultural, and thus also literary, production is a site of continual conflict. One of the central issues at stake in this struggle is the 'monopoly of literary legitimacy'. Bourdieu defines this as the 'power to say with authority who is authorized to call himself writer (etc.) or even to say who is a writer and who has the authority to say who is a writer' (*Rules*, p. 224). In this way participants in the field want the power to consecrate producers and their products. Moreover, any established definition of the writer 'may be radically transformed by an enlargement of the set of people who have a legitimate voice in literary matters' (Field, p. 42). As a result, expansion within the field perpetuates conflict.

The 1890s represent a period of continued statistical expansion within the literary field. From the end of the eighteenth century the production of the printed word had been rapidly increasing. Journals, monthlies and weeklies all began to appear as never before. Correspondingly, access to the printed word became easier and in combination with the education acts and other demographic factors throughout the nineteenth century the size of the possible audience also grew. By 1890 those in the writing profession discovered more options opening for them in the field. They did not need to publish a novel, nor even an edition of poetry, but could become journalists, literary advisors or agents. The appearance of these new

positions created new tensions within the field between art and trade. Where did literature end and commerce begin?

The epitome of art for its own sake was personified by the entry into the field of Oscar Wilde and other so-called decadents in the first half of the decade, who positioned themselves directly in conflict with another new and growing group within the field, the 'New Journalists'. These new voices in the field constituted a challenge to incumbent position-holders, alongside the education acts, the appearance of popular classics and new companies. It is perhaps no coincidence that it is at this time that the field was thrown into further crisis by the disappearance of some of the most powerful 'producers of the meaning and value' of art (*Field*, p. 37), not least Mudie and his circulating library. Peter McDonald suggests that:

by creating a closed system of mutual economic advantage, among writers, publishers, and book borrowers, Mudie gained unprecedented and unsurpassed control over the book world and exercised a virtual monopoly of the power to define literary value in his terms (which were primarily moral and commercial). The resentment this caused among avant-garde writers in the 1880s, like Hardy, George Moore, Gissing and W. E. Henley is legendary [. . .] and, according to Bourdieu's model, unsurprising.⁷

Since 1842 Mudie had defined what would be accepted in his libraries, and consequently what would appear before the consumers. It was in 1894 that his terms of acceptance were redefined, moving away from three-decker novels and stating a new preference for one volume editions. Guinevere Griest argues that, with the extinction of the three volume format, came the end of the Victorian circulating library.⁸

Michel Foucault has suggested that 'it would be worth examining in a culture like ours, what status [the author] has been given, at what moment studies of authenticity and attribution began, in what kind of system of valorization the author was involved'.⁹ Bourdieu argues, moreover, that any understanding of the

author depends initially on understanding 'the status of the writer [. . .] at the moment considered' (*Field*, p. 163). This introduction offers an insight into some of the 'systems of valorization' or 'defining voices' competing for legitimacy in the 1890s.¹⁰ Investigating the status 'authors' were given at this time provides an initial reconstruction of the literary field in which all the writers under consideration were functioning.

It centres around two contradictory contemporary opinions of authorship, embracing the conflict at the heart of the legitimacy conflict in the 1890s between a growth in the democratisation of the field on the one hand, and a developing hierarchy of art on the other. Presented first is the argument that art could be learned, implying a 'correct' way to accomplish it, which many creators felt relegated the art of literature to a mere trade, and consequently opened the field up to all. Second, the increased interest in the artist over and above his work, elevating the author to a new celebrity status is considered. The chapter looks at the appearance of the literary manual, the literary biography and the growing cult of authorship that was epitomised through such phenomena as literary tourism and the portrayal of the 'celebrity' author in the popular press. Each is presented as one of the many voices seeking to impose their values of art and the artist onto all position-holders in the field, including the artists.

As long as censorship, literary prizes and other tokens of canonicity exist, there is the implicit suggestion that there is a correct way to write which makes a text more acceptable, or valuable, as a work of art. New expressions of literary 'correctness' began to appear in the last decades of the nineteenth century presenting a further challenge to the creators. I wish to consider, first, the overt method applied by the literary manuals in this period and second, the

more covert, but perhaps more influential, technique employed in literary biographies.

The Literary Manual

In *New Grub Street* (1891), George Gissing depicts Whelpdale as a writer who, having failed to gain popularity as a novelist, achieves success by publishing practical guides to writing. Gissing is documenting the frequency with which these literary guides, or manuals, began to appear in the 1880s, but is also questioning the legitimacy of the voices behind them. Along with the development of English Literature as a university subject at this time, these texts are indicative of a wish to professionalise the literary field.¹¹ How could authorship be a profession, it was thought, if it did not have rules which could be learnt and schools at which it could be taught?¹²

In 1886 Percy Russell published *The Literary Manual, or A Complete Guide to Authorship*, the very construction of which reflects a fundamental growing tension within the field as a result of the diminishing distinction between the former categories of art and trade. Demonstrating the varying connotations of the term 'authorship' in its title, the first half of the book is devoted to the fiction-writer, while the second concentrates on the 'new' literary trades and, specifically, 'the current aspects of journalism and Periodical writing'.¹³ Like other literary manuals, Russell's book was aimed at young writers or literary aspirants inspired by the recent growth of the literary field. Necessarily, it plays down the importance of inherent 'genius', emphasising, instead, the need for rules and guidance. Citing Victor Hugo as 'one of the best and worst of story-tellers', Russell argues that while good techniques can hide lack of art, art cannot hide lack of technique (p. 78). Further empowered by Russell's early assertion that 'Genius alone often

achieves only a splendid failure' (p. 6), the young writer is given individual chapters on poetry, fiction and drama with the corresponding 'rules' for each genre. Accordingly, the budding poet is supplied with a comprehensive explanation of metre and rhyme alongside a brief history of poetry, while the aspiring dramatist is advised to learn the 'mechanics' of the stage.

Russell demands that a young writer should consider himself as a 'faithful photographer and reporter' because it is 'probably in Realism only that great and fortune-making successes in the art of Fiction will be attained' (p. 41). This illuminates the principle behind Russell's book. He works on the assumption that newcomers to the field do not want to learn how to produce art, but how to produce art which sells. Depending on an audience for such popular success, Russell's book concentrates on fulfilling what he perceives are existing reader-demands, and in doing so the manual perpetuates them. His theory is further exposed when he admits that the type of novel he is promoting does not constitute 'high art', having already explained that the 'greatest and the truest poetry is by no means that in the most demand' (p. 21). Such connections between literary production and monetary success pervade the guide. Russell admits that he cannot teach them art, and that no amount of 'technics *per se* [can] create a novelist'; all he can convey is how to be technically proficient and meet the demands of the public. The blatant prostituting of art in this way - reducing it to consumer demands - is the tendency which Gissing protests against in *New Grub Street*.

The Art of Authorship: Literary Reminiscences, Methods of Work, And Advice to Young Beginners (1890) by George Bainton represents another type of literary manual. Using questionable means Bainton had collected opinions on literary production from over 180 people ranging from Bishops and Lords to journalists and novelists.¹⁴ The book's first chapter addresses the question of whether good writing is a gift or an art; in other words whether it can be taught

or not. Bainton quotes many 'good writers' in an attempt to find an answer. The majority of the writers assert that their art is not self-conscious, nor teachable, echoing G. A. Henry's belief that no 'teaching system or course of instruction, can result in turning out an author. With prose writers or with poets a man is born, not made'.¹⁵ Naturally, this was not a conclusion appropriate for a literary manual, the very existence of which relied on the premise that, after some careful instruction, a literary career was open to all. Therefore, it is unsurprising to find Bainton contradicting the authorial evidence he, himself, has discovered. He asserts:

Still I cannot but feel that the common idea about genius and natural gift is most pernicious. It has a too serious tendency to set up insurmountable barriers to the masses of men, while they sit down in the conviction that they are nothing and that effort is useless.

(p. 40-1)

To justify his own publication, Bainton had to challenge the elitist authorial position, as he encountered it, with democracy. Therefore, he reiterated throughout that any obstacles to entry into the literary field could be overcome through careful and methodical study.

Again, young aspirants are advised in this book about the most suitable type of work to produce. In direct conflict with the tenets of decadence, Bainton declares that 'writing which is extravagant [. . .] that is spoiled by striving after effect, that is not simple, direct, natural lacks the one thing [. . .] to maintain its hold on men. It is doomed to die, though for a generation it may lead the fashion' (p. 193). He proceeds to give his own definition of art:

For what is art but the doing of anything as well as it can be done? To be artistic is to be faithful, to be true to our highest ideal, conscientiously to finish everything and to leave nothing in a slovenly manner, to do with our might whatever our hands find to do. The humblest worker becomes an artist when moved by such a purpose; the simplest work becomes a work of art when thus accomplished.

(p. 351)

Clearly, this is a definition of art which is in direct opposition to the other voices competing for legitimacy within the manual, namely the interviewed writers themselves. The manuals sought to define the artist and his art to a new type of readership and a number of artists recognised that the writers of these guides were shamelessly catering for a demand, and that, even worse, they were enlisting the 'masses of men' to join them.

The manuals by Russell and Bainton share one common irony. In both, the young writer is advised how best to write: to be realistic; to follow the grammatical rules; to have a plot; to keep it simple. Yet they both also underline the importance of being true to oneself. Russell asks the young poet to 'look at everything he writes directly, and not through the form of expression that someone else has employed' (p. 21), while Bainton devotes a whole chapter to quotes emphasising the importance of 'Truthfulness to One's Self'. The aspiring author is, seemingly, to attempt to be true to himself, while simultaneously demonstrating all the 'essential' qualities which these type of manuals propounded.

The appearance of such literary manuals affected the status of art and authorship in two ways. First, they relegated authorship to a trade which could be taught, rather than presenting it as a talent to be admired. In consequence of this they also opened the field up to anyone antagonistic towards the elitist aspects of the cultural field, presenting the literary field as a site of growing opportunity. In addition, the guides which taught aspirants to write were soon joined by guides which directed readers what to read. Again, Russell took

advantage of this opening and published *A Guide to British and American Novels* (1894). Its objective was not to 'commend books [. . .] it merely places before [the reader], in a succinct form, a trustworthy account, brief as is compatible with lucidity, of the principal novels and romances of the past'.¹⁶ Once more artists had cause to lament this new development. Such guides, by their very essence, served to categorise writers. J. M. Barrie's work had the dubious honour of appearing in two sections of Russell's readers' guide, mentioned not only in the chapter on 'Scotch and Irish Novels' but placed in 'Comic and Humorous Novels' as well. These guides represent one indication of the emergence, at this time, of a developing canon for a new kind of reader, a tendency which was to find an even fuller expression in the new critical biographies that were then also appearing.

The Critical Biography

The late Victorian period saw a rapid increase in the hitherto most prevalent form for defining writers, the literary biography. Through an increased fascination with biographies, the focus from the work of art to the life of the artist was to shift as the nineteenth century progressed. By 1939, Virginia Woolf could remark that the 'interest in ourselves and in other people's selves is a late development of the human mind. Not until the eighteenth century did that curiosity express itself in writing the lives of private people. Only in the nineteenth century was biography fully grown and hugely prolific'.¹⁷ If the number of publications can be taken as any indication, the Victorians did indeed seem to be fascinated by the lives of others, a development anticipated as early as the 1830s when Thomas Carlyle observed that, 'Man's sociality of nature evinces itself, in spite of all that can be said, with abundant evidence by this one fact, were there no other: the unspeakable delight he takes in Biography'.¹⁸

Woolf was to define the problems facing biographers during the late Victorian period in the following terms:

Suppose, for example, that the man of genius [...] threw the boots at the maid's head. The widow would say, 'Still I loved him - he was the father of my children; and the public, who love his books, must on no account be disillusioned. Cover up; omit.' The biographer obeyed. And thus the majority of Victorian biographies are like the wax figures now preserved in Westminster Abbey, that were carried in funeral processions through the street - effigies that have only a smooth superficial likeness to the body in the coffin.¹⁹

The publication history of Elizabeth Gaskell's *Life of Charlotte Brontë* is perhaps one of the best illustrations of the Victorian fixation with keeping the dignity of the subject in the face of any unfavourable. The obstacles to publication which Gaskell faced because people demanded 'cover ups' are well documented, resulting in libel suits and a consequent editing for the third edition.²⁰

The last decades of Victoria's reign saw the transformation of the literary biography. The intimidating voluminous length of a biography was to be replaced with a small volume aimed more directly at instructing the new readership on appropriate reading matter. It was to be intrinsic in the creation of a canon for the newly literate classes and by proposing what and who was suitable to read these biographies also implied what could be classified as a work of art, consequently compiling a list of reader expectations. One of the most successful collections of such biographies was John Morley's 'English Men of Letters' series.

The first EML series ran from the late 1870s until the thirty-ninth and final volume in 1892 and the New Series added another twenty-five volumes between 1902 and 1919. Each volume was about 60,000 words and encompassed the life and works of the subject. As a project, the EML series had an air of respectability about it from the very beginning, implying an inherent power to consecrate, because its main producers were already legitimate voices within the field of literary production. Morley had already achieved a name for himself as editor of

the *Fortnightly Review* and the series was published by the highly reputable Macmillans. Moreover, the individual writers were carefully chosen as people who could add further legitimacy to the project, and included such well reputed names as Henry James, Leslie Stephen and Anthony Trollope.

Morley's Prospectus to the series reveals why it was felt there was a need for such a series. He addresses it to those who have to 'run while they read', a class which he deems to be immense and to include those whose 'education will have made them alive to the importance of the masters of our literature'.²¹ The aim of each volume was to 'be copious enough to be profitable for knowledge and life, and yet be brief enough to serve those whose leisure is scanty'. The audience, therefore, was to be situated between the intellectual classes and the illiterate, an audience which Morley realised 'must every year increase'. Tuned to an audience similar to that which New Journalism was later going to gear itself towards, Morley's prospectus, as F. J. M. Korsten suggests, could have been written by Jasper Milvain, Gissing's fictional personification of New Journalism.²²

Although Morley, and others, may have had a certain audience in mind for their books, they could not restrict it arbitrarily and there is evidence that they were read by a more literate class. On 26 March 1891 George Gissing wrote to his brother, Algernon, 'I am going through a good many of the "Men of Letters" series; they are well-written books, most of them. But some of these modern critics - men like Gosse & Masson & Minto & even Leslie Stephen seem to me to have earned their reputations very easily'.²³ His apparent admiration of the series is undermined by the manner in which he effectively challenges the legitimacy of the contributors to consecrate the authors.

The EML series was, however, one of the most successful of the many Victorian 'projects' which sought to prescribe 'codes for the regulation of reading and the consumption of cultural products in general'.²⁴ One of the functions of the series was to guide the new literate classes through the mass of literature to 'high'

literature, or more specifically to what Morley and his contributors considered to be 'high' literature.²⁵ Accordingly, in contrast to the literary manuals, they emphasised the existence of a hierarchy within the literary field. John L. Kijinski shows the way in which the series, through these 'representatives of respectable culture - as embodied by those affiliated with Macmillan - asked their contemporaries to approach fiction'.²⁶ He argues that the idea behind the series was to calm the crisis, which Morley perceived, in literature and readership in 1877. Adolphus William Ward's volume on Dickens outlines the significance of suitable reading. Issuing an implicit warning about the dangers of inappropriate reading, he declares that 'inasmuch as [Dickens] was no great reader in the days of his authorship, and had to go through hard times of his own before, it is as well that the literature of his childhood was good of its kind, and that where it was not good it was at least gay'.²⁷

What these 'representatives of respectable culture' had to do was, to say the least, a difficult task, involving the condensation of the life and works of an author *and* his place in literature to 60,000 words. Richard Altick associates the theory of biography in 'the age of Henry James' to the corresponding new ideal within fiction: 'selectivity, not uncontrolled abundance; distillation, not elaboration'.²⁸ Leslie Stephen, for one, found such a task restrictive. Having completed his volume on Pope, feeling as if a 'halter had been taken off [his] neck',²⁹ and having subsequently been told that he had to edit it considerably, Stephen wrote to Morley:

I cannot honestly say that I shall have pleasure in complying with your request. On the contrary, I do not at all like cutting out twenty-four pages of work which has given me a great deal of trouble. But I know, of course, that you must necessarily be guided by obvious considerations which have nothing to do with the fancies of the author, and, moreover, I know that the fault is mine in the first place for exceeding my tether.³⁰

Bearing in mind the audience at which the series was aimed, the EML texts had to be short and contain information which was easy to assimilate. This was a departure from the earlier principles of biography, as the prefatory notes to many of the volumes indicate. In these notes the authors make references to the works from which they gathered their information. So, for example, when Richard H. Hutton begins his work on Scott he admits that 'the greater part of this little book has been taken in one form or another from Lockhart's *Life of Sir Walter Scott*', a biography published in seven volumes.³¹ Equally, William Minto is indebted to three earlier biographies of Defoe. In the main, therefore, the series was not covering new territory, rather it was re-assessing the position of the writers under consideration within the field of literary production.

An exception is to be found in the EML volume on Thackeray undertaken by Anthony Trollope, which claimed to cover new ground simply because no previous biography of the novelist existed, as Trollope explains in his introduction:

Thackeray, not long before his death, had had his taste offended, by some fulsome biography. Paragraphs, of which the eulogy seemed to have been the produce rather of personal love than of inquiry or judgement, disgusted him, and he begged of his girls that when he should have gone there should be nothing of the sort done with his name.³²

Thackeray had little respect for the kind of Victorian biography which sought to honour its subject at the expense of what he felt should be an objective account of the life. With this in mind, Trollope asserts that 'it is certainly not my purpose to write what may be called a life of Thackeray', and as a result the construction of his text differs from the other volumes.³³ While the majority of the contributors presented the life and works concurrently, Trollope wrote one long biographical chapter followed by a separate consideration of Thackeray's work. It is significant, however, that Thackeray's personal thoughts on the matter did not prevent a biography from being written. It is clear that authors had no more control over

their presentation in the field than anyone else. All that they could do was enter the struggle to impose the dominant definition along with all the other competing voices.

Kijinski's investigation into the EML series is consciously limited to the nine novelists chosen for the first series. He chooses them, specifically because, as novelists, they posed the greatest challenge because, at the time of publication, the actual genre of prose fiction was normally seen and presented as second-rate.³⁴ Consequently, when it came to assessing the place of some of these novelists in the English literary canon few could be certain their status would last. In the chapter on the future of Dickens's fame, Ward wrote:

The form, again, of Dickens' principal works may become obsolete, as it was in a sense accidental. He was the most popular novelist of his day; but should prose fiction, or even the full and florid species of it which has enjoyed so long-lived a favour ever be out of season, the popularity of Dickens' books must experience an inevitable diminution.³⁵

The only way that the novel could go 'out of season', however, was if these particular critics won the struggle for the monopoly of power. It would seem in this aspect, at least, they did not. Critics could not usurp the consecration bestowed upon the novel by the mass audience and, in the same way, authors could not impose their views upon the critics.

Kijinski points out aspects of similarity amongst the portrayal of the novel-writing Men of Letters, suggesting that they not only impose a 'correct' standard on the literature, but on the writers themselves. Many of the lives are defined as bourgeois success stories, tacitly assuming that if the writer is respectable then it follows that his works must be and if the life of the subject is not respectable other tactics have to be used. In the case of Sterne, H. D. Traill asks the reader to remember the 'disadvantages of Sterne's early training, in judging of the many defects as a man, and laxities as a writer which marked his later life'.³⁶ His

flirtations in matters of love are condemned as promoting 'those effeminate sensibilities of his into that condition of hyper-æsthesia which, though Sterne regarded it as a strength, was in reality the weakness, of his art'.³⁷ In this way not only were the private actions of the writers now being taken into account in the interpretation of their works, but their actual voiced opinions were becoming increasingly irrelevant.

The insistence of linking the work of an author with his life was common in all series formulated along the same lines as the EML. The Great Writers Series edited by Eric Robertson and Frank T. Marzials exemplifies this aspect. The series began in 1887, with books on Longfellow, Coleridge, Dickens and Dante Gabriel Rossetti, and continued into the 1890s. Richard Garnett's *Life of Carlyle* (1895) shows clearly the ways in which these biographies began to associate fact with fiction. Garnett states that the 'indivisible short-clothes suit of yellow serge immortalized in "Sartor Resartus" was historical' and talks of Carlyle's regard 'for Margaret Gordon, the "Blumine" of "Sartor Resartus"'.³⁸ Garnett's text demonstrates another two points. First, he highlights the importance of the author's name when he admits that Carlyle's *Life of Schiller* 'may not have lived without his name' (p. 29), addressing, in embryonic form, aspects of Michel Foucault's 'author function'.³⁹ Second, he shows that the value of any work was increased, at this time, if it revealed something about the author. Carlyle's criticisms of Wordsworth, Keats, and Shelley, for example, 'could only be described as idle if they had not been a solid piece of the man himself' (p. 32), while, one of his essays in the *Edinburgh Review* on German Literature may have lacked 'sense, moderation and judgement' but it was nonetheless 'invaluable as a profession of faith and as a picture of Carlyle's mind' (p. 45). The personality of the author, for this biographer at least, was being allowed to not only influence, but change the interpretation and value of the writing.

The division between the author's life and his work was, therefore, becoming less distinct. Augustine Birrell's *Life of Charlotte Brontë* illustrates that even the biographers themselves were confused. Initially he accepts that authors live lives quite independent from their works, citing the example that no-one presumes that Shakespeare has the characteristics of Richard III. However, he proceeds to undermine his own argument in his introduction:

The Life of Charlotte Brontë has been written once and for all by Mrs Gaskell; but as *no criticism of Miss Brontë's work is possible apart from the story of her life*, I have attempted the biographical sketch the following pages will be found to contain.⁴⁰ (italics mine)

It was indeed a time when it must have seemed as if no criticism was possible without reference to the author's life.

In 1882, another Victorian 'project' was begun. Like the EML, it was the combined brainchild of a literary man and a publisher, however this time it was a philanthropic venture. This time it was fronted by Leslie Stephen and George Smith and the project was the *Dictionary of National Biography*. Smith started the enterprise believing, correctly, that he would lose money from it. In the 'Memoir to George Smith' in the first supplement to the *DNB*, published in 1901, Sidney Lee refers to the *DNB* as 'a new and final enterprise, which proved a fitting crown to [Smith's] spirited career' (p. xlv). In need of an editor for the Dictionary, Smith purloined Stephen from his editorial post at *The Cornhill*, a magazine whose circulation had recently been dropping.

The aim and methods of the project were expressed by Stephen in *The Athenæum* on 23 December 1882. His intention was to provide:

the greatest possible amount of information in a thoroughly business-like form. Dates and facts should be given abundantly and precisely; it is of primary importance to give in all cases, and upon a uniform plan, a clear reference to the primary authorities; and in the case of literary biographies it is important to give a full bibliographical notice.⁴¹

While any 'elaborate analysis of character or exposition of critical theories' was irrelevant to a *DNB* contribution, characteristic anecdotes were necessary, as well as expressing clearly 'the view taken by a statesman [. . .] or of the position in the history of literature of a remarkable poem'.⁴² This pragmatic approach indicates what Ira Bruce Nadel means when she reflects that the *DNB* 'represents the apex of the Victorian belief in, and commitment to, fact, reflecting the importance of science and history in the age'.⁴³

The main problem associated with the project was fixing its scale in terms of the number of names and the space allowed for each. Stephen supplies two initial pre-requisites for inclusion. One, everyone had to be British or Americans who were also British subjects, and two, they had to be dead. Thereafter, every June and October a list of names would appear in *The Athenæum* in order to invite both criticism and co-operation. Using *The Athenæum* in this manner, not only for lists but for editorial announcements and notices to subscribers, was an intelligent move. It alerted magazine readers of a 'particular calibre' to its existence, which was necessary because although eventually the bulk of the work was undertaken by permanent staff, Stephen had to select the initial contributors from known specialists and replies from the magazine.⁴⁴ Readers of *The Athenæum* were not only canvassed as contributors to the *DNB*, but as readers and subscribers.⁴⁵

The wealth of information contained within the first sixty-three volumes of the *DNB* is a tribute to the work of Smith, Stephen and Sidney Lee, who took over from Stephen in 1891. From his letters it becomes clear that the Dictionary became too much for Stephen. One of his initial complaints concerned the contributors. In 1884, before the first volume even appeared, he wrote, 'My greatest worry is struggling against the insane verbosity of the average contributor. I never knew before how many words might be used to express a given fact'.⁴⁶ Modern research has questioned the accuracy of the information within the *DNB*, but the continued value for the historian is in the abundance of personal anecdotes. Many of the

bibliographies begin by citing 'family and private sources' which are now unavailable.⁴⁷

The *DNB* project tried to be more objective than Morley's. It did not actively seek to place any value judgements on the subjects, beyond the acknowledgement that they had achieved something which justified their initial selection for inclusion in the *DNB*. In contrast, Morley decided on thirty-nine individuals whom he considered deserved consecration as 'Men of Letters'. While Morley concentrated solely on the field of literary production, the *DNB* considered the writer's position within society as a whole, placing him as an equal beside the scientist, the explorer, the philosopher and others, defined by facts and figures. The *DNB* was not a leading competitor in the struggle to gain the sole power of consecration of art, but signified an attempt to bring some order to the mass of information which was being made available at the time. Its overall influence is hard to determine because it was a point of reference for so many people. Garnett, when writing on Carlyle for the EML, for example, had turned to the *DNB* and found Leslie Stephen's article 'most serviceable as a luminous digest of the subject'.⁴⁸

Series like the EML played a significant role in formulating an accessible canon in an attempt to control the developing readership. However, the literary biographies appearing in the latter years of the nineteenth century, and to a lesser extent the *DNB*, also created a hierarchy within the field of literary production. Certain authors were consecrated above others, some given 'Great Writer' status while others were denied it. While the manuals presented the field as an open, welcoming forum, these texts quietly reiterated the difference between 'high' and 'low' art, in their own terms.

By connecting the author's work with his life, the literary biographies attempted to reach a conclusive definition of each author and hence justify the

position they allocated him in the literary field. The significance of the author, separated from his text, increased as the nineteenth century drew to a close and literary interpretation began to rely more heavily on extra-textual information. Such information was further disseminated through such phenomena as literary tourism and the portrayal of the 'celebrity' author in the popular press, which together created the cult of the author.

Literary Tourism: The Cult of the Author

From the beginning of the nineteenth century people had wanted to know where authors had been born, worked, lived and even died and one manifestation of this growing phenomenon was the literary pilgrim.⁴⁹ Elbert Hubbard was one literary pilgrim who realised that his own experiences would interest others, and could thus be made profitable. In the 1890s he began to publish his *Little Journeys* series which depicted his own literary pilgrimages to Britain for an audience that was initially American and unable to experience the sights for themselves. Each book was a compilation of previously published, monthly booklets on selected individuals which contained a brief sketch of the chosen figure and his surroundings, with varying amounts of each.⁵⁰ The series was not restricted to *Little Journeys to the Homes of English Authors* and eventually covered, amongst others, the homes of American statesmen, great musicians, eminent painters and famous women. Hubbard explained what he hoped to achieve in these publications in his foreword to *Little Journeys to the Homes of Famous Women*:

In every life where spirit and intellect truly blossoms there are a few persons and a few events that stand out like fixed stars. Of these I have endeavoured to speak. I have also tried to give a glimpse (that was mine) of the environment that played its part in the Evolution of the Soul.⁵¹

The first journeys were published in 1894 by Hubbard's own Royecroft Shop after other publishers, misjudging the audience, refused them. All the evidence endorses Hubbard's own belief in the project: the subscriptions for the booklets reached 1000 in six months with a circulation eventually reaching 70, 000, and the reviewers were kind.⁵² Hubbard understood the public's interest in visiting the homes of the famous:

I met a young man who told me that he was exposed at Kelmscott House for a brief hour, and caught it, and ever after there were in his mind, thoughts, feelings, emotions & ideas that had not been there before. Possibly the psychologist would explain that the spores of all these things were simply sleeping, awaiting the warmth of some peculiar presence to start them into being; but of all that I cannot speak - this only I know, that the young man said to me, 'Whereas I was once blind, I now see.'⁵³

Invoking the religious imagery appropriate for a discussion of pilgrimages, Hubbard ratifies what Bill Bell suggests is one of the two reasons for such travels: moral and spiritual edification. The second is the prevalent idea that a 'visit to an author's locale will somehow reconstitute the identity of the author himself and thereby shed interpretative light on the reading experience'.⁵⁴ Again, it is believed that the art can be better defined through the life and experiences of the artist and correspondingly the author is elevated to an idolised position.

The *Little Journeys* series perpetuated this idea. To write on John Milton, Hubbard had walked across the fields from Eton through Birnham Beeches and Stoke Poges. He had felt that 'one treads on storied ground, and if you wish you can recline beneath gnarled old oaks where Milton mused and scribbled and wrote the first draft of "L'Allegro" and "Il Penseroso" ' (p. 106). The impression that Hubbard is gaining from his visits, that he is beginning to 'see', is a consistent one throughout the series.

The places Hubbard visited were simultaneously transforming themselves more explicitly into tourist attractions because it was now in the financial interests of these sites of pilgrimage to sustain the quasi-religious position being conferred upon the author at this time. When Hubbard eventually finds Haworth Parsonage the rector's wife knows why he is there. Not only does she know that he wants to see the home of the Brontës and proceed to give him a guided tour, but in anticipation of the visitors it is beginning to receive, Charlotte's room now has the desk she wrote at with sheets of manuscript and letters in her writing placed upon it.⁵⁵

W. Bevan James, an early biographer, reveals that Hubbard was forced to publish the series himself because other publishers thought that 'his writings were too blunt, his views - not always orthodox - too strongly expressed for the susceptibilities of their readers'.⁵⁶ This lack of orthodoxy is apparent in his treatment of Elizabeth Barrett Browning. After explaining that she approached her father for forgiveness for her elopement, he concludes, 'but Edward Moulton Barrett did not forgive - still who cares!'.⁵⁷ Such lack of deference is consistent with his openly negative opinion of the portrayals of literary giants by others. In *Little Journeys to the Homes of English Authors* he argues that Mrs Sutherland Orr's biography of Robert Browning is no more than an example of 'excessive hero-worship'.⁵⁸

As Bell asserts 'perhaps no one in his lifetime was more responsible for propagating the notion of hero-worship' than Thomas Carlyle.⁵⁹ In 1840 he had published a collection entitled *On Heroes, Hero-Worship and the Heroic in History*, but Carlyle's own thoughts about his new house also exemplify his attitude:

We might see at half a mile's distance Bolingbroke's Battersea; could shoot a girl into Smollett's old house [. . .] where he wrote 'Count Fathom,' and was wont every Saturday to dine a company of hungry young authors [. . .]; Don Saltero's coffee-house still looks as brisk as in Steele's time; Nell Gwynne's boudoir, still bearing her name has become a gin-house [. . .]. We are encompassed with a cloud of witnesses, good, bad, and indifferent.⁶⁰

This clearly depicts Carlyle's interest in the environments of renown; an interest attested to by the literary pilgrimages he made to the homes of Goethe and Luther, amongst others, throughout his own life. It is apt, therefore, that Carlyle's house was the first to be transformed into a formal museum.

In July 1895 the house which Thomas Carlyle had inhabited from 1834 until 1881 was opened to the public, becoming the first literary house museum in London. Bell remarks that 'for many years, this was the only Literary House Museum in a city with scores of such potential sites, making its establishment a unique phenomenon in its day'.⁶¹ To advertise its opening, Reginald Blunt published *The Carlyles' Chelsea Home, being some account of No. 5, Cheyne Row*, a book written for people who were already interested in Carlyle and to promote interest in the House Museum. It provides a brief history of the house from Carlyle's death in 1881 until its opening 14 years later, followed by a history of the Carlyles through their house: where and when the meals were served; where Carlyle wrote what; and who visited. For example, Blunt describes the dining room as the room that Carlyle wrote *The French Revolution*, where Jane Carlyle received Tyndall's telegram and where Carlyle died. As a result, he describes it as a room 'charged with tragic and distinguished memories, the psychic influence of which no desolation, however profound, has been able to destroy' (p. 20). Claims of authenticity were further enhanced by the donation of furnishings and books by Carlyle's niece.

During the six weeks after its opening in 1895, Carlyle's house was visited by 'over a thousand persons from all parts of the world'.⁶² Its popularity was perpetuated by publications such as Blunt's which re-ignited interest in Carlyle. Another which is advertised in *Carlyles' Chelsea Home* is *A Centenary Memorial, 1895: Thoughts on Life by Thomas Carlyle*, with the editor's share of the profits going to the Centenary Memorial Fund. Fortunately, by 1895 the bad publicity which had followed Froude's publication of Carlyle's memoirs had started to subside, but, as Bell points out, the irony is that many visitors were drawn only because of the same unacceptable revelations.

The interest in the extra-textual aspects of authorship continued to grow into the next century, reflected in the appearance of early tourist guides like Edward Thomas's *A Literary Pilgrim in England* (1917).⁶³ Thomas's book is divided up by regions, commenting on associated writers, with a list which is more comprehensive the further south the region. 'The Downs and the South Coast' contains Aubrey, White, Cobbett, Hazlitt, Jeffries, Hardy and Belloc, while 'The North' has only Wordsworth and Emily Brontë. Within the book the idea of empathising with the author as a result of shared surroundings is propounded. Considering Meredith's fifth pastoral, Thomas writes

To read this and to know that it was written on 'an eminence surrounded by pines on the St. George's Estate,' is to know something of Meredith's habits as a man and writer in his early thirties.⁶⁴

J. M. Barrie had been equally anxious to view the home of this writer decades earlier. In a speech to the Society of Authors in his capacity as President he revealed that, 'when [he] first came to London [he] bought a silk hat to impress editors, and with the remainder of the sovereign [he] took a ticket to Box Hill, where Meredith lived'.⁶⁵ The extent to which the homes of authors had become important by 1938 had already been alluded to at the beginning of the speech.

Barrie had related a friend's reassurance that, 'Everybody is famous for something, and you are famous for living opposite Bernard Shaw'.⁶⁶ The anecdote, whether true or not, is representative of the status now granted to spatial proximity to an author's environment. The cult status conferred by literary pilgrims, related publications and tourist attractions, upon the author was compounded by the presentation of the 'celebrity' author within the popular press of the 1890s.

The 'Celebrity' Author

The popular press's presentation of the author is the final defining voice to be considered in this chapter. It is the voice which elevated the author to 'celebrity' status. Richard Salmon, in his appraisal of the celebrity author, considers the development of the interview to be fundamental. He suggests that the 'proliferation of literary interviews during this period bore witness to the increasingly pervasive definitions of authors as celebrities, and thus, for some observers, seemed to threaten the cultural distinction of authorship itself'.⁶⁷ Combining the demand of the literary manuals for advice on authorship with the new immediacy of interviewing, authors were solicited for information about their working methods. G. B. Burgin briefly recounts the writing habits of some of his literary acquaintances, for example, in an article entitled 'How Authors Work' in *The Idler* (1896). He explains how some write in the mornings, some only the evenings; how some correct while others rarely do. He depicts Gissing's writing habits although Gissing had confided in him that 'he feared there was nothing noteworthy to be said about his methods of work'.⁶⁸ Again, as in Bainton's manual, the author's own defining voice is silenced, this time because Burgin realises that anything about an author is now of interest.

Jerome K. Jerome capitalised upon the public's enthusiasm for authors. As editor of *The Idler* he republished a series of articles from the magazine called *My First Book* (1894). Twenty-two authors contributed their memories of writing their first book to provide an insight into their writing careers and their opinions of their works. Quiller-Couch was under no illusions about his initial effort, *Dead Man's Rock*. He pointed out that 'later editions have been allowed to appear with all the inaccuracies and crudities of the first. On page 116, Bombay is still situated in the Bay of Bengal, and may continue to adorn that shore'.⁶⁹ The authorial anecdotes are interesting, but more revealing are the varying interpretations of the task. How did each author construe the term 'first book'?

Conan Doyle interprets 'first book' to mean the book he wrote when he was six, alongside the failed attempts of his youth, rather than his first publication. Stevenson, in his contribution, implicitly chastises the public's perception of what his first book in fact was. He writes on *Treasure Island* although he considers it:

far indeed from being my first book, for I am not a novelist alone. But I am well aware that my paymaster the Great Public, regards what else I have written with indifference, if not aversion; if it call upon me at all, it call upon me in the familiar and indelible character; and when I am asked to talk of my first book, no question in the world but what is meant is my first novel.⁷⁰

Taking advantage of the opportunity to voice his own opinion on his work, he hints at the discontent he feels at accepting definitions of himself, and his work, imposed by external forces.

Nigel Cross describes the 'My First Book' series as a 'lavishly illustrated tour around the homes of the famous' because the words of the various authors are accompanied by photographs or sketches of their respective libraries, studies, houses and spouses.⁷¹ Richard Salmon indicates that the introduction of photographs produced a 'radical apprehension of intimacy' between author and reader, and comments that by the 1890s 'most literary interviews were conducted

"at home" ' (pp. 169 & 116). In this way magazines were perpetuating the current interest in the homes of authors as sights where inspiration had occurred.

The use of photography supplied another means of defining the author. One regular series in *The Strand*, which illustrates that the writer could now be safely classified as a celebrity made great use of the new technology.⁷² Alongside the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Duke of Westminster, and A. J. Webbe, a cricketer, in 'Portraits of Celebrities', Robert Louis Stevenson's life is summarised:

Mr. Robert Louis Stevenson is the son of Mr. Thomas Stevenson, the celebrated light-house engineer, and was born in Edinburgh. The book which established his reputation was 'Treasure Island,' published in 1883. 'Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde,' published in 1888, is perhaps his most popular work. Mr. Stevenson has taken up his residence in Samoa, and we are enabled to give an illustration of the room in which he writes his delightful stories.⁷³

Beside this 'biography' are pictures of Stevenson at twenty months, age seven, seventeen, twenty-five and thirty-five, implying that to obtain such photographs the 'celebrities' must themselves have co-operated. Condensing the lives of celebrities even more radically than the *DNB*, this series was more comprehensively aimed at those who 'must read as they run'. The focus is on illustration rather than literary criticism and the positioning of the author as a celebrity in this manner did lead to a corresponding cutback on textual analysis in the popular press.

The 'Chapter on Ears' in *The Strand* shows pictures solely of the ears of famous people, highlighting their different characteristics. It discovers that in J. M. Barrie's ear the angle of his helix curve is completely absent, 'the top presenting a square line'. It concludes that although 'aurognomy is not yet in a sufficiently advanced state to determine' what is specifically Scottish about this ear, 'it may be observed that the largest lobe is Mr. Barrie's'.⁷⁴ There are no literary pretensions in this

article; the works of the author are not mentioned, even briefly. The writer has become merely a face, or specifically an ear, to analyse.

In 'Some Famous Chairs' *The Strand* satirically develops a new type of literary criticism based upon the furniture used by writers, an idea triggered by a quote from Thackeray. He had, reportedly, suggested that the coats of distinguished men possessed as 'marked an individuality as their characters and lineaments'.⁷⁵ *The Strand* considers what the consequences of applying this theory to the favourite chairs of celebrated people might be:

Anthony Trollope's chair of American pine, given to Mr. Godwin by the novelist's family, has been rightly described as 'a hard, uninstructional chair, without an idea in it.' This character does not apply to the favourite chair of his illustrious contemporary, Charles Dickens - that simple, but comfortable arm-chair which the author of 'Pickwick' used in his study at Gad's Hill Place.⁷⁶

The article offers a critique of the tendency, by the popular press in the 1890s, to transfer literary significance from the work onto the individual author and his possessions. The elevation of the author to celebrity status seemed, paradoxically, to diminish the importance of the literature that the author had produced.

Michel Foucault's essay 'What is an Author?' asserts that the author's name has a 'classificatory function' in regard to narrative discourse. The name allows the critic, or reader, to 'group together a certain number of texts, define them, differentiate them from and contrast them to others'.⁷⁷ The development of such an 'author function' is embodied in the literary biographies of the 1890s. The relationship between the text and the author was being re-defined and literary criticism was becoming as dependent on knowledge about the writer as it was on a consideration of the text. It is no coincidence, then, that the 1890s also saw the disappearance of the anonymous contributor. Foucault explains:

We now ask of each poet or fictional text: From where does it come, who wrote it, when, under what circumstances, or beginning with what design? The meaning ascribed to it and the status or value accorded it depend on the manner in which we answer these questions.⁷⁸

Salmon uses as an illustration the plot from Henry James's story 'Death of a Lion' (1894) to represent the answers being given during this time. In this story the 'work of the author is displaced from its position as a privileged object of literary interpretation by a proliferation of new cultural practices which construe the "life" as a more vital source of meaning'.⁷⁹

This chapter has looked at the ways in which issues of authorial legitimacy became increasingly conspicuous at the end of the nineteenth century. With new voices came new opinions and an author in the 1890s found himself being constantly categorised. Literary biographies would determine whether or not he was a Man of Letters, while the *DNB* constructed him as an amalgamation of factual data. His work was to be judged according to his looks, possessions, actions, and home. Further, now it was purported to be as easy to become an author as to become any other tradesman; there were rules and techniques which could be learnt. Therefore, the writer had to fight against the way he was presented by these 'arbiters of taste' in the field of production.

The struggle to define the author, represented by these voices, points towards the conflict at the heart of the field of literary production which centres around opposing principles of legitimacy and valuation for cultural works. The popular press was placing the author on a pedestal, while the literary manuals were cheapening his art at the same time. An author had the intrusion of the press and public into his private life on a scale hitherto unknown, but his resultant status of celebrity was offset and contradicted by the more immediate danger of the professionalisation of the literary trade. It is

within this 'legitimacy conflict' that authors had to function and it is their points of view with which the following chapters will be concerned.

The equilibrium of the field of cultural production was endangered by the emergence of the literary manual and attempts to teach the public how to write for money. They professed that anyone could learn the literary trade and consequently, that anyone could enter the field. Therefore, a conflict between democracy and elitism in the literary field of the 1890s can be seen to be revealed in the defining voices considered. These differing principles of hierarchization unveil one of the fundamental oppositions upon which the field of cultural production is structured; the opposing principles of legitimacy operating in the sub-fields of large-scale and restricted production, which will be considered in the next chapter.

The author in the 1890s had to somehow position himself in regard to these current and conflicting opinions, not least within the conflict between art and trade, elitism and democracy, independence and demands. The fact that some 'artists' were courting their own celebrity status worried at least one contemporary writer. In 1894 Margaret Deland declared that 'journalism, or to be more exact, personal journalism, is doing more today to injure the art of Literature than ever hunger and cold and neglect did!'⁸⁰ Her argument was that regardless of a work's quality, the press had no right to the author, and that any author who allowed themselves to be used by the press in this way would fall foul of unnecessary 'self-consciousness'. Deland's solution was to refuse to be interviewed. She instructed her fellow writers that, 'We can learn not to think too highly of ourselves'.⁸¹

As Bourdieu argues, writers, like Deland, function in a field which is the site of 'the struggle to impose the legitimate definition of the writer' (*Field*, p. 42), and the field of the 1890s saw a dramatic enlargement in the number of people with legitimate voices within this struggle. It is perhaps natural,

therefore, that many authors at this time wanted to enter the debate and, as a consequence of the expansion of the field, found a number of ways in which this could be achieved. They could either state their case explicitly in the form of autobiographies, prefaces or critical essays, or veil their opinion within their fiction. It is the voices of four authors working in the 1890s and its aftermath with which the pages that follow are concerned, how, in other words, such authors reacted to their positions within the field of literary production.

Bourdieu demonstrates that increased debate and the attendant transformation of the definition of the author are not the only consequences of an enlarged field. Expansion leads in addition to greater autonomy of the field to create its own terms of reference.

The relative opening up of the field of cultural production due to the increased number of positions offering basic resources to producers without a private income had the effect of increasing the relative autonomy of the field and therefore its capacity to reinterpret external demands in terms of its own logic.

(*Field*, p. 55)

The opposition between democracy and elitism found in the conflict to define the author becomes a 'more profound dispute about the principles of valuation'.⁸² The conditions of growing democracy within the field had the paradoxical effect of simultaneously creating greater possible autonomy. Therefore, the following chapters seek to reassess some authorial reactions to not only the external demands and definitions placed on authors but to the specific logic of the field of literary production.

Endnotes: Chapter One

¹ Pierre Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*, ed. by Randal Johnson (London: Polity Press, 1993), p. 42. Further references to this text are given after quotations in the text marked, *Field*.

² Victor Bonham-Carter, *Authors by Profession*, 2 vols. (London: Society of Authors, 1978-1984), I, is an important source of information on the history of Copyright and the role played by the Society of Authors. See Chapter Five for examples of these inadequacies, pp. 90-119.

³ Alexander Moffat, 'What is an Author?', *The Juridical Review*, 12 (1900), 217-231 (p. 218). Further references to this article are given after quotations in the text.

⁴ Molly Nisbet, 'What Was an Author?', *Yale French Studies*, 73 (1987), 229-257 (p. 230). Further references to this article are given after quotations in the text.

⁵ Nisbet argues that the most compelling justification was proof that 'a human factor over-rode the mechanical process', p. 236.

⁶ Bourdieu is arguing that the history of the field is not only the history of this struggle, but that it is in this very struggle that the history of the field is made. Pierre Bourdieu, *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*, trans. by Susan Emanuel (London: Polity Press, 1996), p. 157. Further references to this book are given after quotations in the text marked, *Rules*.

⁷ Peter D. McDonald, *British Literary Culture and Publishing Practice, 1880-1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 19.

⁸ Guinevere Griest, *Mudie's Circulating Library* (Devon: David & Charles, 1970), p. 6.

⁹ Michel Foucault, 'What is an Author?', in *The Foucault Reader*, ed. by Paul Rabinow (London: Penguin, 1984), 101-20 (p. 101).

¹⁰ Bourdieu describes three competing principles of legitimacy at work within the field. The first is the recognition given by other artists. Second is the consecration granted by the 'dominant fractions of the dominant class'. In other words it is recognition from institutions, and which I take to include literary critics as well as schools and galleries. Finally there is the consecration given by the mass public, *Field*, p. 50-1.

¹¹ See Chris Baldick, *The Social Mission of English Criticism, 1848-1932* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983) and Jo McMurtry, *English Language, English Literature: The Creation of an Academic Discipline* (London: Mansell, 1985), as examples of studies into the development of English literature as a 'subject'.

¹² This was the argument used by Walter Besant in his 'Art of Fiction' lecture. See Chapter 3.

¹³ Percy Russell, *The Literary Manual, or A Complete Guide to Authorship* (London: London Literary Society, 1886), p. 9. Further references to this book are given after quotations in the text.

¹⁴ The opinions of these authors were obtained in dubious circumstances as Bonham-Carter observes. Bainton wrote letters to authors on the pretence of soliciting their help for a lecture on art and its composition which he was to give for young people. When no lecture took place, a book was published and the authors, quoted without permission, complained to the Society of Authors. Bainton upheld his innocence in *The Author*, 1 (1891), p. 84. See Bonham-Carter, pp. 160-1; also Nigel Cross, *The Common Writer: Life in Nineteenth Century Grub Street* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), p. 220.

¹⁵ George Bainton, *The Art of Authorship* (London: James Clarke, 1890), p. 19. Further references to this text are given after quotations in the text. Morris, in his inimitable style, gives another reason for 'young beginners' to give up before they start. His advice to them is to realise that they are slaves and that all their energies

should be put 'towards winning freedom [. . .]. Under such conditions art and literature are not worth consideration', p. 61.

¹⁶ Percy Russell, *A Guide to British and American Novels* (London: Digby, Long, 1894), p. vi.

¹⁷ Virginia Woolf, 'The Art of Biography', in *Collected Essays by Virginia Woolf*, ed. by Leonard Woolf, 4 vols. (London: Hogarth Press 1966-7), IV, 221-228 (p. 221).

¹⁸ Thomas Carlyle, *Critical and Miscellaneous Essays*, centenary edn., 5 vols. (London: Chapman and Hall, 1899) III, p. 44.

¹⁹ Woolf, p. 222.

²⁰ For example of objections raised against the first edition see Arthur Pollard, *Mrs Gaskell Novelist and Biographer* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1965), p. 165.

²¹ William Minto, *Daniel Defoe*, English Men of Letters Series, ed. by John Morley (London: Macmillan, 1879), p. 173. All further references to the Prospectus are taken from this page.

²² F. J. M. Korsten, 'The "English Men of Letters" Series: A Monument of Late-Victorian Literary Criticism', *English Studies*, 73 (1992), 503-516 (p. 505).

²³ Pierre Coustillas, Paul F. Mattheissen & Arthur C. Young, eds. *The Collected Letters of George Gissing*, 9 vols. (Athens: Ohio University Press, 1990-1997), IV (1993), p. 278.

²⁴ John L. Kijinski, 'John Morley's "English Men of Letters" Series and the Politics of Reading', *Victorian Studies*, 34 (1991), 205-225 (p. 205).

²⁵ Naturally, the aims were not exclusively altruistic inasmuch as the publisher did want to make money from the project. At the end of each book there is a list of available titles from the series and then other Macmillan titles. For example, after H. D. Traill's *Sterne* the advertisement for Macmillan's Globe Library includes *Sir Walter Scott's Poetical Works*, a new edition of *Robinson Crusoe* and *Milton's Poetical Works*, all works by authors whom, it is no coincidence, are also feature in the EML series.

²⁶ Kijinski, p. 207.

²⁷ Adolphus William Ward, *Dickens*, English Men of Letters Series, ed. by John Morley (London: Macmillan, 1882), p. 4.

²⁸ Richard D. Altick, *Lives and Letters: A History of Literary Biography in England and America* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1969), p. 204.

²⁹ Frederic William Maitland, *The Life and Letters of Leslie Stephen* (London: Duckworth, 1906), p. 338.

³⁰ Maitland, p. 338-9.

³¹ Richard H. Hutton, *Sir Walter Scott*, English Men of Letters Series, ed. by John Morley (London: Macmillan, 1878), p. v.

³² Anthony Trollope, *Thackeray*, English Men of Letters Series, ed. by John Morley (London: Macmillan, 1879), p. 2.

³³ Trollope, p. 2.

³⁴ Kijinski, p. 211-2.

³⁵ Ward, p. 197.

³⁶ H. D. Traill, *Sterne*, English Men of Letters Series, ed. by John Morley, (London: Macmillan, 1882), p. 9.

³⁷ Triall, p. 29.

³⁸ Richard Garnett LLD, *Life of Carlyle*, Great Writers Series (London: Walter Scott, 1895), pp. 13-4 & 20. Further references to this text are given after quotations in the text.

³⁹ See Foucault, p.101-20.

- ⁴⁰ Augustine Birrell, *Life of Charlotte Brontë*, Great Writers Series (London: Walter Scott, 1887), Prefatory Note.
- ⁴¹ Leslie Stephen, 'A New "Biographica Britannica"', *The Athenæum*, No. 2878 (1882), 850 (p. 850).
- ⁴² Stephen, 'A New "Biographica Britannica"', p. 850.
- ⁴³ Ira Bruce Nadel, *Biography Fiction, Fact and Form* (London: Macmillan, 1984), p. 53.
- ⁴⁴ Gillian Fenwick, *The Contributors' Index to the Dictionary of National Biography, 1885-1901* (Hampshire: St. Paul's Bibliographies, 1989), p. xii-xv.
- ⁴⁵ Gillian Fenwick, 'The Athenæum and the Dictionary of National Biography, 1885-1901', *Victorian Periodicals Review*, 23 (1990), 180-88 (p. 181).
- ⁴⁶ Maitland, p. 383.
- ⁴⁷ For an example of the pitfalls of taking the DNB as an accurate source today see Laurel Brake, 'Problems in Victorian Biography: The DNB and the DNB "Walter Pater"', *The Modern Language Review*, 70 (1975), 731-42.
- ⁴⁸ Garnett, p. 9.
- ⁴⁹ See Altick, pp. 115-18. He writes that 'Stratford was the first of what became in time a chain of literary holy places, objects of pilgrimages', p. 116.
- ⁵⁰ Hubbard produced one booklet every month for fifteen years. See W. Bevan James, *Elbert Hubbard Master Man* (London: C. W. Daniel Ltd, 1917), p. 34.
- ⁵¹ Elbert Hubbard, *Little Journeys to the Homes of Famous Women* (London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1897), p. 3.
- ⁵² James, p. 26.
- ⁵³ Elbert Hubbard, *Little Journeys to the Homes of English Authors*, n.s. 6 (New York: Roycrofters, 1900), p. 17.
- ⁵⁴ Bill Bell, 'Empty Spaces: A Visit to Cheyne Row', *The Carlyle Society Papers*, n.s. 5 (1992) (no page references).
- ⁵⁵ Hubbard, *Famous Women*, p. 136.
- ⁵⁶ James, p. 26.
- ⁵⁷ Elbert Hubbard, *Famous Women*, p. 37.
- ⁵⁸ Elbert Hubbard, *English Authors*, p. 29.
- ⁵⁹ Bell.
- ⁶⁰ Reginald Blunt, *The Carlyles' Chelsea Home, being some account of No. 5, Cheyne Row* (London: George Bell and Sons, 1895), p. 14-5. Further references to this text are given after quotations in the text.
- ⁶¹ Bell. A map in Blunt's record reiterates the significance of Cheyne Row and Chelsea, showing houses where people of literary and artistic note, including Eliot, Meredith, Rossetti and Swinburne, had lived, Blunt, p. 2-3.
- ⁶² Blunt, p. 47.
- ⁶³ Literary tourism has grown rather than dwindled throughout the years. So, the situation arises that in the late twentieth century there is apparent justification for republishing this early tourist guide which first appeared in 1917, in 1980 and again in 1985. Unfortunately, because the newest edition contains photographs alongside Thomas's words, Davies has had to exclude some names, including Meredith, Arnold and Stevenson. Edward Thomas, *A Literary Pilgrim in England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980); Edward Thomas, *A Literary Pilgrim: An Illustrated Guide to Britain's Literary Heritage*, ed. by Michael Justin Davies (Exeter: Webb & Bower, 1985).
- ⁶⁴ Edward Thomas, *A Literary Pilgrim in England* (1980), p. 46.
- ⁶⁵ J. M. Barrie, *MacConnachie and J. M. B.: Speeches by J. M. Barrie* (London: Peter Davies, 1938), p. 155.
- ⁶⁶ Barrie, p. 158.

⁶⁷ Richard Salmon, 'Signs of Intimacy: The Literary Celebrity in the "Age of Interviewing"', *Victorian Literature and Culture*, 25 (1997), 159-77 (p. 160). Further references to this article are given after quotations in the text. Salmon concentrates on the new aspects of interviewing including photography, authors' homes and the relationship between the interviewer and interviewee. He writes that 'the interviewer is positioned as the definitive subject of the discourse, whilst the interviewee is situated as the object of investigation and display', p. 161.

⁶⁸ *The Idler*, 9 (1896), p. 346.

⁶⁹ Jerome K. Jerome, ed., *My First Book* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1894), p. 269.

⁷⁰ Jerome, p. 297.

⁷¹ Cross, p. 219.

⁷² McDonald suggests that the *Strand's* 'circulation figures became one of the publishing sensations of the 1890s', rising from 200,000 sales a month in 1892, to between 300,000 and 350,000 by 1899, p. 156.

⁷³ 'Portraits of Celebrities at Different Times of their Lives', *The Strand*, 6 (1893), 261-66 (p. 264).

⁷⁴ 'Chapter on Ears', *The Strand*, 6 (1893), 525-27 (p. 527).

⁷⁵ F. G. Kitton, 'Some Famous Chairs', *The Strand*, 6 (1893), 407-15 (p. 407).

⁷⁶ Kitton, p. 410.

⁷⁷ Foucault, p. 107.

⁷⁸ Foucault, p. 109.

⁷⁹ Salmon, p. 159. This story can be found in Henry James, *The Figure in the Carpet and Other Stories*, ed. by Frank Kermode (London: Penguin, 1986), 259-303.

⁸⁰ Margaret Deland, 'A Menace to Literature', *The North American Review*, 158 (1894), 157-63 (p. 158).

⁸¹ Deland, p. 163.

⁸² McDonald, p. 14.

CHAPTER TWO

Internal Conflict: George Gissing and *New Grub Street*

One of the major difficulties of the social history of philosophy, art or literature is that it has to reconstruct these spaces of original possibles which, because they were part of the self-evident givens of the situation, remained unremarked and are therefore unlikely to be mentioned in contemporary accounts, chronicles or memoirs.

Pierre Bourdieu¹

In books lies the soul of the whole Past Time; the articulate audible voice of the Past, when the body and material substance of it has altogether vanished like a dream [. . .]. All that Mankind has done, thought, gained or been: it is lying as in magic presentation in the pages of Books.

Thomas Carlyle²

The battle within the field of cultural production, as shown in the opening chapter, is one to obtain 'the monopoly of the power to consecrate, in which the value of art and the belief in that value are continuously generated' (*Field*, p. 78). Therefore, the field, including all its agents, works on a system of belief and its production. Its conception does not allow for any one individual creator of art perceiving that any work of art is seen to exist 'only by virtue of the (collective) belief which knows and acknowledges it as a work of art' (*Field*, p. 35). By situating authors and their texts not only within their individual relationships with publishers or literary agents, but within a 'more profound dispute about the principles of valuation', Bourdieu's model approaches the literary field from a new angle.³ Peter McDonald explains that Bourdieu is not only concerned with 'actual

interactions between, say, authors and publishers [. . .] but with the implicit structures underlying such relations'.⁴

In 'The Place of Realism in Fiction' (1895) George Gissing concluded that:

Every novelist beholds a world of his own, and the supreme endeavour of his art must be to body forth that world as it exists for him. The novelist works and must work subjectively. A demand for objectivity in fiction is worse than meaningless, for apart from the personality of the workman no literary art can exist [. . .] what can be more absurd than talking about the objectivity of Flaubert, who triumphs by his extraordinary power of presenting life as he, and no other man, beheld it?⁵

Bourdieu does not deny the subjectivity of the author, neither does he demand objectivity from fiction *per se*, but as a sociologist he seeks to objectify this subjectivity. He explains that:

Paradoxically, we can only be sure of some chance of participating in the author's subjective intention (or, if you like, in what I have called elsewhere his 'creative project') provided we complete the long work of objectification necessary to reconstruct the universe of positions within which he was situated and where what he wanted to do was defined. In other words, one cannot take the author's point of view (or that of any other agent) and come to an understanding - but an understanding very different from that enjoyed, in practice, by the person who actually occupies the point under consideration - unless the author's situation in the space of constitutive positions within the literary field is grasped anew.

(*Rules*, p. 88)

Gissing seemed, albeit less consciously, aware of the importance of this principle in regard to fair literary criticism. His longest, and arguably most enduring, critical work, *Charles Dickens: A Critical Study* (1897) is rooted in an embryonic, and naturally less scientific, reconstruction of the field under consideration. In his treatment of Dickens, Gissing is anxious to try to reconstruct the literary world which Dickens had experienced, comparing it with the aesthetically self-conscious time in which he himself now functioned. In effect, he attempts to re-create the relationship between Dickens's position and the other position-holders competing for legitimacy in the field at that time. In consequence,

Gissing does not condemn Dickens for considering his readers, or even for making changes to please them because 'art itself was less exacting in his day: a multitude applauded and why should he meddle with what they had so loudly approved'.⁶ In other words, Dickens was writing at a time when audience approval was not the 'kiss of death' it became for many in the late nineteenth century and there was no ensuing shame connected with consciously seeking popularity.

Gissing allows critics to ask themselves how Dickens's writing differs from the 'prevalent conception of art' only if they first acknowledge that the standards upon which they are judging are new. He emphasises that the day, or field, of the fin-de-siècle critic, was not that of Dickens and advocates that it would subsequently be unfair to judge him harshly on standards which did not exist when he was writing. The first quotation of the epigraph however, illustrates that it is difficult, if not impossible, to re-create a field outside of its own time because it is 'part of the self-evident givens'. Nonetheless, having already provided a sociological reading of Flaubert's *Sentimental Education*, Bourdieu does accept Carlyle's proposition reiterating that 'few works do not bear within them the imprint of the system of positions in relation to which their originality is defined' (*Field*, p. 118). Of all works few bear such a clear imprint as George Gissing's *New Grub Street* (NGS) (1891). The usefulness of Gissing's writing in this respect was highlighted as early as 1933 when Ruth Mackay remarked:

Each character is a study of his age. If you desire to learn of the latter quarter of the nineteenth century and would have your knowledge of the spirit as well as the form, to read the novels of George Gissing is to reap a rich harvest.⁷

This chapter considers Gissing and NGS which, as a microcosm of the literary world at the end of the nineteenth century, can be helpful in revealing some of the positions and structural conflicts within the field.

Re-Positioning George Gissing

To attempt to re-create Gissing's position in his contemporary field requires investigation not only of his individual relationships with his critics, but of the objective relations underlying them. The following extract from a letter to his close friend, Eduard Bertz, presents a good starting point because it infers a position in the literary field which conflicts with that within the field of class relations.

At the beginning of 1890, recounting an incident occurring on the return journey from his first trip to Europe, Gissing wrote:

The other morning the ship's parson happened to have a talk with me, and he evidently observed my name written on a book I was reading. The next morning he approached me with a grin and began: "I hear you are a celebrated author." He explained that someone in the first class had heard him mention my name and had at once recognized it. This has symbolic significance. It is my fate in life to be known by the first-class people and to associate with the second class - or even the third and fourth. It will always be so.⁸

Bourdieu does not contend that social and economic conditions do not influence the field, but suggests that rather than merely reflecting these external demands, the literary field refracts them, as Peter McDonald highlights, 'like a prism refracts light'.⁹ This investigation begins, therefore, with Gissing's uneasy position within the largest social field, that of class relations.

The field of class relations, like all of Bourdieu's 'fields' is a site of conscious and unconscious conflict between the dominant and the dominated. The dominant wish to retain the status quo which consecrates power on their attributes of wealth and education, while the dominated struggle to effect change. Between these two opposites lie many possible positions, and as Gillian Tindall explains, Gissing held an ambiguous one. In her reflections of Gissing's status as a 'born exile', she suggests that Gissing's lifelong preoccupation with owning his own house is

indicative of 'those born into the insecure classes'.¹⁰ But from where did this insecurity come?

The general critical consensus is that Gissing's sense of class alienation stemmed from his father. In this regard, two aspects of Thomas Gissing are important. First, although he was the village pharmacist, Tindall suggests that both Gissing's parents somehow felt 'a cut above their neighbours'.¹¹ Gissing explains that none of the children 'came in contact with the families of other shopkeepers; so that we hung between two grades of society'.¹² Second, John Halperin suggests that Gissing's education 'prepared him to live in one social class and the facts of his life compelled him to live in another', an education which began with his father.¹³ From him Gissing inherited the 'gentleman's ethic of reading for its own sake', which was to combine easily with an 'exaggerated respect for the classics' which he learnt at school and which represented another 'mark of the educated Englishman of the period'.¹⁴

These family aspirations cannot conceal, however, that Gissing did not belong to the dominant class. He belonged to that inconclusive 'twilight zone between "middle" and "working" class', which today could be easily termed as lower-middle class, but which in the last decades of the nineteenth century defied classification. As one of the 'insecure classes', the Gissing family 'regarded themselves as being above the crudeness of working people' while never actually achieving 'that other frankness and freedom from the fear "of what other people will think" which is born of effortless social society'.¹⁵

A look at the attitude towards language fostered in the Gissing household, should confirm that Gissing stands in the middle of the conflict between those 'who inherit and those who inherit only the aspiration to possess, that is the bourgeois and the petit-bourgeois' (*Rules*, p. 15). Bourdieu argues that the acquisition of language is fundamental to education and thus 'the sociology of language is logically inseparable from a sociology of education'.¹⁶ Being born into



a family which recognises the importance of language, is very different, however from inheriting the knowledge of it. Bourdieu explains that 'disparity between [. . .] aspirations and the means of satisfying them - a disparity that generates tension and pretension - is greatest in the intermediate regions of the social space' (p. 62).

In Bourdieu's terms it is the *petit-bourgeois* who inhabit such intermediate regions and as a result have a 'tendency to hyper-correction', in contrast to the bourgeois tendency towards 'controlled hypo-correction' (p. 62 & 63). He concludes:

In short, one of the privileges of consecration consists in the fact that, by conferring an undeniable and indelible essence on the individuals consecrated, it authorizes transgressions that would otherwise be forbidden. The person who is sure of his cultural identity can play with the rules of the cultural game.

(p. 124)

Therefore, the 'pedantic concern for the use of language' which Tindall reveals in Thomas Gissing can be interpreted as a manifestation of his cultural insecurity.¹⁷ It is a disposition which Gissing appears to have inherited when he takes the time to observe that 'the pronunciation of the word "here" is the best test I know of a speaker's social position'.¹⁸

By entering the literary field Gissing takes a position in a field available to someone of his disposition and limited inheritance. The field of cultural production attracts 'a strong proportion of individuals who possess all the properties of the dominant class *minus one*: money' (*Field*, p. 165). His diary entry for 17 January 1891, ten days after Smith & Elder accepted *NGS*, reveals that by this stage Gissing perceived himself to be part of the literary field. He records an incident at the Registry Office where in reply to giving his occupation as 'literary man', the registrar had said to the clerk 'Put "gentleman"'.¹⁹ This suggests that his already ambiguous position within the field of class relations had been further

complicated. The literary field occupies a dominated position within the field of power, itself situated in the dominant pole of the field of class relations. Structurally, therefore, the literary field is the site of a double hierarchy. Economically it is dominated, culturally it is dominant, and by entering this specific field the structural contradictions of Gissing's position double in intensity. It should not be surprising, therefore, to find themes of exile and class alienation within his writing.

Gissing is justified in referring to himself as a 'literary man' in 1891. The first signed fictional publication by Gissing, 'The Artist's Child', had appeared in *Tinsley's Magazine* in 1877. Therefore by the time of *NGS*'s publication he had been functioning among the field's particular forces for 14 years, but it is argued that the appearance of this, his ninth novel, represented a watershed in his career. Michael Collie suggests that *NGS*, alongside *Born in Exile* (1892), marks Gissing's 'escape from continental naturalism', whereby he turned away from social realism towards 'a type of psychological novel'.²⁰ Indeed the publication of *The Nether World* (1889) is often seen as the last in a series of novels, viewed either as 'working-class' or 'low-life' novels', or as representing Gissing's developing attitudes towards realism.²¹

The first in this 'series', published at his own expense, was *Workers in the Dawn* (1889) which Jacob Korg has described as a novel of 'social protest' and Pierre Coustillas as 'an impassioned, rough-hewn manifesto striking wildly at Victorian evils and shams'.²² Gissing, himself, warned his family that it was not 'a novel in the generally-accepted sense of the word', but an attack on features of religion and society which he condemned. He contended that 'herein I am a mouthpiece of the advanced Radical party'.²³ Such a fervent assault on society by Gissing in this early piece can be explained by what Bourdieu terms the 'effect of the homologies' (*Field*, p. 44).

Bourdieu argues that 'the struggles within the field of power are never entirely independent of the struggle between the dominated classes and the dominant class, and the logic of the homologies between the two spaces means that the struggles going on within are always overdetermined' (*Field*, p. 44). Thus writers who accrue reputation but no money from their art, and are consequently occupying a culturally dominant, but economically dominated position within the literary field, 'tend to feel solidarity with the occupants of the economically and culturally dominated positions within the field of class relations' (*Field*, p. 44). In their own way each is trying to impose new systems of valuation at variance with the established order to secure domination. The result is the formation of 'partial alliances' which nevertheless maintain a 'prudent distance' (*Field*, p. 44).

Gissing entered the literary field, and to an extent the field of class relations as a 'pretender', with what Bourdieu terms a typically 'petit-bourgeois' vision of the world of power. It is the vision held by those who are outside the field of power but aspire to enter it and which is half optimistic, believing that determination can accomplish anything. On the other hand it is half desperate 'since the secret springs of the mechanisms are left to *plotting* among the initiated', that is those who have inherited the relevant attributes. The reaction to this state of affairs is not disappointment, because that would infer an admission of gratitude, but resentment; 'resentment is a submissive revolt' (*Rules*, p. 18).

Gissing initially entered the field with a 'petit-bourgeois' disposition, intent on using art to change society, but the early years of the 1880s saw Gissing's life 'gradually taking on a more middle-class colouring'.²⁴ He was associating with consecrated literary men like John Morley and Frederic Harrison, frequenting the Gaussens' upper-class household and living in a proper flat. Having gained limited consecration he was now more intent on defending what power he had than demanding social revolt. Gissing's development at this time followed that of 'rebellious bohemianism' through to 'disillusioned conservatism' (*Rules*, p. 18)

and accordingly he did not look back fondly on *Workers in the Dawn* and *The Unclassed* (1884). By 1889 he wrote that 'not for any consideration would I open those dreadful books! All I have ever written seems to be apprentice-work', an aspect recognized by Tindall.²⁵ She propounds that the various stages which Gissing passed through with regard to charity, philanthropy and the education of the working-class democracy is revealed in his novels, and certainly Gissing's 'partial alliance' with the dominated class seems to break down later in the 1880s. Again it is a development, the reason for which, should be found in the conditions of the field.

An initial supporter for the spread of democratic education, Gissing's early idealism was destroyed 'by a disillusioning collision with *demos*', a theme at the heart of his seventh novel appropriately entitled *Demos* (1886).²⁶ In this work, as in *Isabel Clarendon* (1886) and *A Life's Morning* (1888), Gissing presents a case against educating the lower classes, reflecting his growing belief that 'some people were better off without education; 'culture', he had decided, could be an 'unmitigated curse' for those unable to fulfil the aspirations it would incite.²⁷ As his literary reputation grew Gissing started to defend the position he had attained, by placing emphasis on the cultural rather than economic power, while simultaneously wishing to restrict the dispersal of 'culture' amongst 'the mob'.

Although *Demos* attacks the working class, it does not defend 'the new class of industrialists' or the 'political Establishment' which remain a source of resentment.²⁸ Bourdieu explains:

Dominated among the dominant, writers and artists are placed in a precarious position which destines them to a kind of objective, therefore subjective, indetermination: the image which others, notably the dominants within the field of power, send back to them is marked by the ambivalence which is generated in all societies by beings defying classifications. The writer - or the intellectual - is enjoined to a double status, which is a bit suspect: as possessor of a dominated weak power he is obliged to situate himself somewhere between the two roles represented in medieval tradition, by the *orator*[. . .] and by the *fool* [. . .]. The structural ambiguity of their position within the field of power leads writers and artists [. . .] to maintain an ambivalent relationship with the dominant class within the field of power, those whom they call 'bourgeois', as well as with the dominated, the 'people'.

(Field, p. 165)

Therefore, *Demos* can be read as a product of the ambivalent relationship which the literary field has towards both the higher and lower classes as a consequence of its own structural ambiguity.

The publication of *NGS* did not mark a turning point just in regard to the 'type' of novel Gissing wrote, but in his status, or value within the field of literary production. As Halperin surmises, '*Demos* made Gissing known, but it took *New Grub Street*, his ninth published novel, to make him popular'.²⁹ It was the only one of Gissing's novels to necessitate a second edition in three volumes, it appeared in Germany, France, Russia and Australia, while in Britain it was the subject of five cheap editions in two years. While his average income per year between 1886 to 1891 was £120, for the years from 1882 to 1899 it rose to £345. Furthermore, its publication precipitated the first of many requests for an interview, suggesting that celebrity status was beckoning.³⁰

As Gissing's repertoire and reputation grew so did the critical discussion about his work, a career development of which Gissing was well aware. In a letter to Bertz in May 1891, he enclosed two copies of the *Saturday Review*. The amusement for Gissing was that they carried conflicting reviews of *NGS*, but the importance was that the latter included another article which made mention of his name 'the kind of thing [he had] never yet seen'.³¹ Seemingly, his name was

mentioned in a list of novelists, including Kipling, Meredith and Stevenson, who did not rely on the peerage for their literary material. Now not only his work was being consecrated, but his name.

The debate between early reviewers seeking to define Gissing centred primarily on his brand of realism and the related charge of pessimism.³² In 1891 *The Spectator* reviewed *NGS* and judged that within its pages, as in his other works, Gissing held 'a brief for pessimism'.³³ *Murray's Magazine* concurred, believing that 'this powerful picture of the strain and stress of literary and journalistic competition is painted in too sombre colours, and that life is less relentless than Realism'.³⁴ Later, in 1897, when *The Academy* was selecting a group of 'Some Younger Reputations', Gissing appeared second in a list containing W. B. Yeats, A. T. Quiller-Couch and Benjamin Swift. Therein was a synopsis of Gissing's work which described *NGS* as a 'remorseless analysis and indictment of Mr. Gissing's own profession'. It continued:

In part, Harold Biffen's theory is Mr. Gissing's also. In part, and not entirely, because Mr. Gissing is not a pure realist. The 'ignobly decent' is his subject; he observes it laboriously, minutely from every conceivable point of view. But he does not merely observe it - he condemns. And that makes all the difference; it turns Mr. Gissing from a realist into a pessimist. A pessimist he is deliberately.³⁵

In each case listed above 'realism' carries negative connotations, but this does not prevent the very critics who are disparaging Gissing from actually consecrating him, and thus creating a belief in his value.

Bourdieu explains that the position of a critic in the field is not merely one which facilitates understanding, but one which actively adds to the discourse surrounding a work, which, in itself, is 'part of the production of a work, of its meaning and value' (*Rules*, p. 170). Moreover, he notes that critical condemnation is a type of consecration because it implies recognition. He explains that the '*Théâtre libre* effectively entered the sub-field of drama once it came under attack

from the accredited advocates of bourgeois theatre, who thus helped to produce the recognition they sought to prevent' (*Field*, p. 42). This principle is recognised by Gissing in *NGS*. First, the part that harsh criticism can play in the process of recognition is illustrated by the fact that Biffen had only discovered Reardon's work as a result of an 'abusive review' that he had read.³⁶ Second, the irony surrounding the value of negative criticism is highlighted when the ability to 'assail an author without increasing the number of his readers' is identified as the perfection of journalistic skill (*NGS*, p. 200).

The importance of the critic in producing the value of an artist's work is echoed in *The Academy* in 1899. It proposed that while the public could give an artist 'notoriety and a vogue which passes' it was the critic who gave the artist his reputation, using the word critic 'to include all those persons, whether scribes or not, who have genuine convictions about an art'.³⁷ It appears to be an embryonic description of the field and boasts:

It may be early, it may be late - the moment surely arrives when, but for the critics, the artist would fall into that neglect which is death. Byron needed no missionaries for half a century; but he needs them now. Keats could not have lived a week without those apostles of faith. And neither [. . .] could Mr. George Gissing.³⁸

Thus by the 1890s, Gissing's work had become consecrated within the field: he had been given a position within the field which he could now accept or challenge.

In May 1895 Gissing's article 'The Place of Realism in Fiction' was accepted for publication in *The Humanitarian*. In terms of interactive relationships it can be read as a reply to the critics which has increased significance because of its temporal proximity to the trial of Oscar Wilde. Gissing discusses the brand of 'realism' which advocated that art should reflect all aspects of life 'no matter how hideous or heart-rending the results', and which maintains that 'the artist has no responsibility save to his artistic conscience' (p. 218). According to Gissing, this

was an extreme position existing in reaction to insincerity in art and it was one which he did not condone. Gissing believed, alternatively, that an artist must recognise limits in every direction. Therefore, from a privileged position of relative freedom of expression, an artist of the 1890s should find himself constantly rejecting 'material as unsuitable for the purposes of art' (p. 220). He concludes by comparing the novelist's freedom of *his* experience with the bondage suffered by authors only ten or twelve years before:

No doubt the new wine of liberty tempts to excess [. . .]. The great thing is, that public opinion no longer constrains a novelist to be false to himself. The world lies open before him, and it is purely a matter for his private decision whether he will write as the old law dictates or to show life as he beholds it.
(p. 221)

But why was there a preoccupation with realism at this time? And why did Gissing participate in it in the way in which he did? In other words, as well as a linear interpretation, Gissing's opinion of realism should also be read as a manifestation of his objectively defined position within the field.

In his discussion of realism Raymond Williams situates the first usage of 'realism' as an English critical term in 1856. On one level it is the British literary response to the entry of the French naturalists into the field, helped by the availability of cheap editions of Zola's and access to the Russian works of Tolstoy and Dostoyevsky. But there is another level. Williams explains that 'realism' was initially construed in opposition to 'idealization or caricature', dealing with 'ordinary, contemporary, everyday' subjects rather than 'heroic, romantic or legendary'.³⁹ However, its meaning was not static and as the century progressed the meaning of 'realism' became many-faceted. For example, Gissing noted that 'in journalistic language' 'realistic' had come to mean simply 'revolting' or 'painful'.⁴⁰ While, when illustrating the 'symbolic embracing of the "real"' at that time, Terry Eagleton can offer three distinct visions: Gissing's nether world of the metropolitan classes; the opium dens of *Dorian Gray*; and the ontological void in

the Belgian Congo. In these ways, William records that 'realism thus appeared as in part a revolt against the ordinary bourgeois view of life', that is as a revolt against the dominant order.⁴¹

Bourdieu highlights the new forms of domination which artists were subjected to in the late nineteenth century, one of which was the emergence of 'industrialists and businessmen of colossal fortunes' indicating 'the reign of money' (*Rules*, p. 48). Graham Hough argues that writers no longer wanted to be accepted by the dominant class or valued in their monetary terms, but in line with Mürger's *La Vie de Bohème*, felt that artists were a class apart, with different standards and aspirations.⁴² Through realism artists were struggling for the autonomy of their own field at a time when the Reform and Education Acts were creating a democratic, literate populace. As Renato Poggioli indicates the 'avant-garde, like any culture, can only flourish in a climate where liberty triumphs', and thus paradoxically the 'epoch of the avant-garde [. . .] is also the era of commercial and industrial art'.⁴³ The new levels of commercialisation and democratisation within the literary field of the 1890s were creating social space for the development of autonomous art, but leaving the position-holders in a state which was neither Victorian, nor Modernist.⁴⁴

Writers no longer wished to be valued by forces in either the economic or political fields, but by their own standards. Conflict arose within the literary field between the 'principle of direct representation which had been the preferred mode of art and literature, and the aesthetic, or self-expressive alternatives arising from sources as remote as the Pre-Raphaelites, the French Symbolist poets, and the ideas of Swinburne and Pater'.⁴⁵ The critics' condemnation of the new interpretations of 'realism' is a manifestation of their wish, as dominant consecrators, to retain the status quo.

For example, in *The Author* Andrew Lang, a critic who 'sniped at Russians and Frenchmen, at naturalists and symbolists, at Thomas Hardy and Henry James',

challenged, not only whether Gissing was a realist, but what the term actually meant. Although he 'reads in reviews about Mr Gissing's "poignant Realism,"' he asks, 'Is it real at all? To [him] it is a perverted idealism, idealism on the seamy side [. . .]. There are plenty of jolly people in Grub Street, only Realism averts her blue spectacles from them'.⁴⁶ This assault on the novel is explained by the position assigned to Lang by John Gross, who explains that:

One of the most distinguishing characteristics of the modern element in literature is that it disturbs. The more he recognized this, the more Lang clutched at the primitive certainties of the penny dreadful. And if novelists insisted on threatening his peace of mind, he was always in a position to retaliate.⁴⁷

NGS did challenge the perceptions of literary life and Lang, from his position as consecrated critic, hoped to silence it with his condemnation. The danger was that Lang did hold a position of power within the literary field, as Gissing recognized. Contemplating the mysterious 'mushroom reputations' of Quiller-Couch, Barrie and Conan-Doyle, he confessed that 'Andrew Lang, & two other such men, if they gave their minds to it, could sell some thousand copies of *any* new book in a fortnight'.⁴⁸ Furthermore, Gross explains that Lang had overcome the escalating problem of differentiating between a best-seller and a 'serious novel' by 'conjuring away the whole problem of relative values' (p. 51). However, the artists were keen that *their* relative values should be recognised, as the literary field entered a period of growing autonomy.

In 'The Place of Realism in Fiction', Gissing recognizes the current ambiguous status of the word 'realism'. He writes that 'one could wish, to begin with, that the words *Realism* and *realist* might never again be used, save in their proper sense by writers on scholastic philosophy' (p. 217). His argument is that, due to their variety of interpretations, the words now lacked any meaning and should be dispensed with. Gissing suggests that instead of imposing fatuous categories, critics should

begin to inquire 'with regard to any work of fiction, first, whether it is sincere, secondly, whether it is craftsmanlike' (p. 218). In Gissing's opinion realism:

signifies [. . .] nothing more than artistic sincerity in the portrayal of contemporary life; it merely contrasts with the habit of mind which assumes that a novel is written to 'please the people,' that disagreeable facts must be always kept out of sight, that human nature must be systematically flattered, that the book must have a 'plot,' that the story should end on a cheerful note and all the rest of it

(p. 220)

In this Gissing is reacting against not only the attitude of critics like Lang, but the 'petit-bourgeois' disposition inherited from his parents. David Grylls suggests that in his attitude towards public opinion Gissing had recognised a 'deep connection between supplying the wants of the vulgar masses and appeasing the whims of the respectable elite' because both 'involved a surrender of individual judgement, an abject deference to prevailing demands'.⁴⁹ However, it must be understood that these are the 'prevailing demands' within the field of power, and in Gissing's article he is submitting himself to the autonomous methods of valuation within the field of literary production.

Gissing did not display the adventures of a romance, nor did he pander to the public's wish for happy resolved endings and so he became classified as a realist and a pessimist, while conflict continued to grow about the exact definition of these categories. His article is the product of a field in conflict over its principles of valuation. He does not want to 'please the people', who by 1899 he describes as 'the multitude' who abhor nothing more than 'a lack of finality in stories, a vagueness of conclusion which gives them the trouble of forming surmises'.⁵⁰ He is not a democrat who wishes the field to be opened to all, rather he wants to defend the position he has on principles, not of capital, but culture. What he fails to realise is that it is only as a result of expansion and democratisation that the literary field can begin to function autonomously.

The dual nature of hierarchization within the literary field has so far only been implied. It is becoming apparent that this field is the site of a struggle between two rival principles of legitimacy, one reducible to economic reward gained from writing for the people and the other more indeterminately measured in terms of 'symbolic' capital. Having outlined the specific social structures influencing Gissing, attention now turns to the structures which determine the field of literary production. The following reading of *NGS* is divided into two sections. The first considers the text in diagnostic terms; the field's structure as defined through Gissing's fiction. The second begins to suggest the conflicts which exist between how the novel represents the field on one level, and how the text actually participates in the field, on another.

NGS: Gissing's Diagnosis of the Literary Field

As discussed earlier it is clear that a structure which functions upon a system of belief does not allow for one individual creator of art. It is a premise which is in part highlighted by Reardon in *NGS* when he suggests that, 'you could be a divine poet, and if some good fellow doesn't take pity on you you will starve by the roadside' (*NGS*, p. 230). This recognition of the primary creator's reliance on other position-holders is one of the many instances in which Gissing's novel fictionalises the state of the field of literary production at the time when he held an increasingly conspicuous position within it; he presents 'a society in miniature, a microcosm of the literary world as he had experienced it'.⁵¹ By only recognising the interactive relationships within the field, however, Reardon fails to perceive that any work of art can only exist 'by virtue of the (collective) belief which knows and acknowledges it as a work of art' (*Field*, p. 35). A reputation is not made by individual 'good fellows' but by the field as a whole.

There are few positions in the field of literary production which are not alluded to within the pages of *NGS*. The main characters represent literal 'creators' of cultural products; the journalist and the novelist, but the creators of the belief and value of art are also portrayed. Alfred was a bookseller before he chose to write; Miss Rupert's father is an advertising agent; John Yule made his fortune from his partnership in a paper-mill; there is a discussion about the establishment of a literary academy and the presence of literary manuals, advisors and agents. In their own way, each character is seeking to define art and the artist in order to unconsciously defend or improve their positions, and the novel illustrates some of the techniques used by those competing for the 'monopoly of the power to say with authority who [were] authorised to call themselves writers' (*Field*, p. 42).

In this section the representation of the literary world of the 1890s which Gissing provides in *NGS* will be used as a medium through which the main structural oppositions of the field of literary production can be revealed. When approaching this text, however, the reader must guard against blindly accepting this fictional novel as fact, which can manifest itself in two ways. There is the initial risk of regarding it as a comprehensive and universal presentation of late-nineteenth century literary life rather than as a fictional representation. Margaret Stetz has recently attacked critics who have 'endorsed almost unquestioningly the truth-claims of *New Grub Street*' and more specifically the claims made about its universality.³² She argues that the picture provided by Gissing is incomplete and therefore although there will always be a place for it, any revised canon of late-Victorian texts should include 'many other contemporary narratives, neglected and out of print, that reflect women's perspectives on the period'.³³

The second danger is the temptation to exaggerate the autobiographical content present within the novel. Resulting from the wish to depict a sincere representation of the literary field as he viewed it, Gissing did draw upon events from his own life and, therefore, *NGS* does contain autobiographical material. However, despite this,

and the fact that he has been described as a 'morbidly autobiographical author', it should be remembered that Gissing's novel is primarily fiction.⁵⁴ As a writer, he found it helpful to use his own experiences to depict certain strata of life in his writing and, moreover, was surprised when others chose not to use this valuable resource. He thought it strange, for example, that Dickens, while using his early experience as an attorney's clerk in his fiction, had never 'cared to use his experience of journalism'.⁵⁵

In 1929, Gissing's son published *Selections Autobiographical and Imaginative From the Works of George Gissing*. The collection is preceded by two perspectives on the relationship between Gissing's life and his work. Virginia Woolf immediately addresses the question in her introduction. She writes, 'Gissing is one of those imperfect novelists through whose books one sees the life of the author faintly covered by the lives of fictitious people'.⁵⁶ On the other hand, in his preface, Alfred Gissing advises a more balanced approach. He admits that while there 'is no writer of fiction, that I know of, whose works are fuller of autobiographical material than those of my father', no greater mistake could be made than 'to attribute at random to the author himself ideas, circumstances or personal characteristics which [...] attach themselves exclusively to the personages of his stories'.⁵⁷ The temptation to fall into autobiographical readings is stronger in a novel like *NGS*, which concerns itself so explicitly with the literary trade.

The novel is one of a growing number which reflected the changing status of the writer at the time. Peter Keating talks about a revolution in the portrayal of writers and writing in fictional works from practical non-existence to the publication of Joyce's *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, indicating that the period of Gissing's life (1857-1903) 'coincides exactly with the most important phase of this complex revolution'.⁵⁸ The period encompassing Gissing's productive years are given further significance by Pierre Coustillas. He argues that these years coincided with 'qualitative and accelerated changes in the field of culture',⁵⁹

changes which are reflected by the further expansion in the field, not only in production and creation, but in participation and readership. The changing definition of the artist at this time is, consequently, understandable in terms of Bourdieu's field because 'the established definition of the writer may be radically transformed by an enlargement of the set of people who have a legitimate voice in literary matters' (*Field*, p. 42).

Gissing includes a critique of the appearance of the 'author as celebrity' in his novel, as one example of the transforming status of the author. Personal journalism, as described in the opening chapter, had resulted from, or alternatively had produced, an interest in the lives of the famous, authors included. He has Whelpdale claiming that a magazine requires one strongly sensational item in it every week and suggesting, by way of illustration, 'What the Queen eats!' or, 'How Gladstone's collars are made!' (*NGS*, p. 498). Through a description of Amy's changing reading habits, Gissing not only gives fictional proof of the growing appeal of this type of article, but also suggests the dangerous implications of their popularity. The narrator explains:

How often she had given her husband a thrill of exquisite pleasure by pointing to some merit or defect of which the common reader would be totally insensible! Now she spoke less frequently on such subjects. Her interests were becoming more personal; she liked to hear details of the success of popular authors - about their wives or husbands [. . .] their arrangements with publishers, their methods of work. The gossip columns of literary papers - and some that were not literary - had an attraction for her.

(*NGS*, p. 99)

The new sensational and personal journalism had not only attracted Amy, but had actively turned her from serious, and good, literary appreciation to mere 'gossip'.

Authors had always had standing in the community, but the new, added celebrity status accentuated it. Mrs Yule's attitude is representative. A literary man was good enough to marry her daughter because he encompassed 'one mode of

distinction' with which she could impress her friends (*NGS*, p. 271). It had also only been as a consequence of this epidemic of 'author awe' that Reardon and Amy had met. Reardon was at the party predominantly because Mrs Carter took great pride in inviting a 'real live novelist' into her house (*NGS*, p. 164). However, neither Mrs Yule, nor Amy can appreciate the artist without parallel monetary success. This is epitomised when Amy remarks that if she had to choose between 'a glorious reputation with poverty and a contemptible popularity with wealth', she would choose the latter (*NGS*, p. 83). The fact that Amy presented these states as mutually exclusive hints towards one of the two basic oppositions upon which the field rests. Bourdieu describes these oppositions as:

first, the opposition between the sub-field of restricted production and the sub-field of large-scale production, i.e. between two economies, two time-scales, two audiences, which endlessly produces and reproduces the negative existence of the sub-field of restricted production, and its basic opposition to the bourgeois economic order; and secondly, the opposition, within the sub-field of restricted production, between the consecrated avant-garde and the avant-garde, the established figures and the newcomers.

(*Field*, p. 53)

Considering the former opposition first, Bourdieu explains that the two sub-fields obey inverse logics. At one pole there is the 'anti-economy' of the field of restricted production, or pure art. It is founded upon the 'denegation of the "economy" (or of the "commercial") and of the "economic" profit (in the short term)'. He continues to elucidate the basic division between the two:

[the field of restricted production] is oriented to the accumulation of symbolic capital, a kind of 'economic' capital denied but recognized and hence legitimate - a veritable credit, and capable of assuring under certain conditions and in the long term, 'economic' profits. At the other pole, there is the 'economic' logic of the literary and artistic industries which, since they make the trade in cultural goods just another trade, confer priority on distribution, on immediate and temporary success measured for example by the print run, and which are content to adjust themselves to the pre-existing demands of a clientèle.

(*Rules*, p. 142)

The difference between these sub-fields, therefore, is that those in the field of large-scale production produce for non-producers (consumers) and those in the field of restricted production produce for other producers of cultural goods (artists). There is a conflict between the two sets of ideals within these sub-fields because they work on different principles of hierarchization. Peter McDonald helpfully describes those in the former sub-field as 'profiteers' and those in the latter as 'purists'.⁶⁰ Those in the field of large-scale production work on the heteronomous principle, which arises from demand and as a result of producing work which sells this is the economically dominant sub-field. Those in the field of restricted production function on the autonomous principle which reverses normal economic standards. Symbolic reward, which gives no short-term financial gain and puts all investment in future reward, is seen as far more significant than popularity in the field of large-scale production because '*discredit* increases as the audience grows' (*Field*, p. 48).

The literary field represented in *NGS* demonstrates admirably the opposing principles of valuation. The microcosm presented by Gissing is organized around two poles; on the one side the sub-field of large-scale production, on the other the sub-field of restricted production. The two opposed universes are introduced in the opening chapter through the contrast of the ideals of Jasper Milvain and Edwin Reardon. The year is 1882 and Milvain has returned from London to his parental home in the country for a short break. The chapter is entitled 'A Man of his Day' and there is evidence both of the growth within the literary field and Milvain's comfortable relationship with it. John Goode suggests that, with every detail, Milvain 'announces a new world'.⁶¹

Milvain describes himself as a 'literary man of 1882', who is learning his business, because, in his eyes, literature 'nowadays is a trade' (*NGS*, p.38). In his opinion, the successful literary man is a skilful tradesman with one predominant attribute:

He thinks first and foremost of the markets; when one kind of goods begins to go off slackly, he is ready with something new and appetising. He knows perfectly all the possible sources of income. Whatever he has to sell he'll get payment for it from all sorts of quarters.

(*NGS*, p. 38-9)

In this way, producing for consumers and functioning on normal economic principles, Milvain is the representative of the field of large-scale production, understanding, only too well, the concepts of supply and demand. Gaining knowledge of the audience is necessary for immediate success in this sub-field and there are signs that this is one lesson which Milvain has already learnt. Not only can he select his own specific audience, but he can also espy openings for his sisters within the expanding field. He is going to write for the 'upper middle-class of intellect', who represent people who like to think that 'what they are reading has some special cleverness, but who can't distinguish between stones and paste' (*NGS*, p. 43-4). On the other hand, he suggests that his sisters try to write religious stories because 'they sell like hot cakes. And there's so deuced little enterprise in the business' (*NGS*, p. 43).

In contrast to this 'energetic young man', Reardon, a struggling 'veteran', is first introduced as 'the kind of fellow to end up by poisoning or shooting himself' (*NGS*, p. 36). He only appears off-stage in this chapter from Milvain's perspective, and in each instance his method of work is compared unfavourably to that of Milvain's. Primarily, the difference between the two men is that Reardon is not the 'kind of man to keep up literary production as a paying business' (*NGS*, p. 36). Milvain describes him as the 'old type of unpractical artist' who will not, or cannot, make concessions to the market, preferring that the 'quality of his work would be its own reward' (*NGS*, p. 38). Clearly, Reardon belongs in the sub-field of restricted production, wishing to ignore market demands and producing work which commands symbolic, rather than financial, reward.

While Gissing presents Milvain as a man who can happily 'play the field', taking advantage of all the new developments, Reardon is characterised as his antithesis; Milvain thinks only of the market, whereas the sound of the very word repels Reardon. Their differing approaches to economic factors are embodied in Milvain's consideration of the publication of Reardon's last novel, *The Optimist*, which was 'practically a failure' in monetary terms (NGS, p. 37):⁶²

If I had been in Reardon's place, I'd have made four hundred at least out of "The Optimist"; I should have gone shrewdly to work with magazines and newspapers and foreign publishers, and - all sorts of people. Reardon can't do that sort of thing, he's behind his age; he sells a manuscript as if he lived in Sam Johnson's Grub Street. But our Grub Street is quite a different place; it is supplied with telegraphic communication, it knows what literary fare is in demand in every part of the world, its inhabitants are men of business, however seedy.

(NGS, p. 39)

Milvain mockingly assigns Reardon's inability to adapt to the pressures of the new commercialised field facing writers in the 1880s to the fact that he is 'absurd enough to be conscientious, likes to be called an "artist," and so on' (NGS, p. 37). Moreover, if as Milvain reveals, 'money is becoming of more and more importance in a literary career; principally because to have money is to have friends' (NGS, p. 59), the implication is that any preference of symbolic over pecuniary reward constitutes a risk.

Indeed, Bourdieu acknowledges that it is difficult to survive in the field of restricted production. To continue to function on the reversed economic principles, the sub-field of restricted production, and its inhabitants, have to be autonomous and thus uninfluenced by external demands. Obviously, in a way of life devoted to securing long-term symbolic reward over short-term economic profit, it would be hard for a writer to survive without his own economic or social capital. Quoting Théophile Gautier, Bourdieu writes, 'Flaubert was smarter than us [. . .]. He had

the wit to come into the world with money, something that is indispensable for anyone who wants to get anywhere in art' (*Field*, p. 68). Bourdieu concludes:

those who do manage to stay in the risky positions long enough to receive the symbolic profit they can bring are indeed mainly drawn from the most privileged categories, who have also had the advantage of not having to devote time and energy to secondary, 'bread-and-butter' activities [. . .]. We also find that the least well-off writers resign themselves more readily to 'industrial literature', in which writing becomes a job like any other.

(*Field*, p. 68)

Therefore, 'capital provides the conditions for freedom from economic necessity' (*Field*, p. 68), a principle which Reardon at least recognises. He quickly realises with Trollopian pragmatism what an 'insane thing it is to make literature one's only means of support' (*NGS*, p. 81).

The problem with survival in the sub-field of restricted production is that the economy works on the investment in symbolic value for future financial reward but, as Milvain suggests, most writers would prefer to 'win reputation before they are toothless' (*NGS*, p. 422). Describing the time-lag in operation in this sub-field he admits that 'the probability is that half a dozen people will at last begin to shout that you have been monstrously neglected, as you have. But that happens when you are hoary and sapless, and when nothing under the sun delights you' (*NGS*, p. 422). Few writers could afford to remain in the field of literary production, let alone the sub-field of restricted production, on the basis of their writing alone. John Sutherland's survey of 848 Victorian novelists found that all but 57 could 'be allocated at least one (and in many more cases more than one) previous or other gainful line of work'.⁶³

The economic reversal of the field of restricted production is indicated in *NGS* by the puns concerning 'value'. In an exchange between Milvain and Maud the dual 'value' of the former's work is discussed:

'And what's the value of it all?' asked Maud
 'Probably from ten to twelve guineas, if I calculated.'
 'I meant, what was the literary value of it,' said his sister, with a
 smile.
 'Equal to that of the contents of a mouldy nut.'

(*NGS*, p. 213-4)

The idea that literary value and monetary value are not commensurate was insinuated when Reardon had to sell his books. The passage, where the intrinsic value of the volumes to Reardon was clearly shown, ends with the statement that 'books are cheap', announcing that a copy of Homer can be purchased for **fourpence** (*NGS*, p. 170). Their value to Reardon exceeds their cost. Equally, when Biffen risks his life to save his papers from the fire, the word 'valuable' is used twice to describe the manuscript, which in monetary terms, was worth only fifteen pounds. He is under no illusions as to the capital worth of his manuscript, undertaking to eat the duplicates of the proofs if it is ever sold, so the value he places upon it must be judged upon non-pecuniary criteria, namely its symbolic worth (*NGS*, p. 407). In this way, Gissing introduces the varying standards of worth within the field, a situation which is made more complicated because both the monetary and the symbolic value of a work of art is continually changing depending, as it does, on the dominant beliefs held within the field at any given point in time.

Both Milvain and Reardon are propelled by Gissing into this matrix of objective relations, each with different aptitudes for success as well a different perceptions of what success means. Neither has inherited wealth or social standing. Both are educated although neither to university standard, and while Reardon has the intellectual advantage, Milvain has charm and ambition. Reardon has a wife, while Milvain is still searching allowing Michael Collie to remark that *NGS* is 'about marriage and not about nineteenth century publishing'.⁶⁴ However, far from being mutually exclusive, in terms of the investigating the literary field's structure, the marriage theme should reveal more about it. Bourdieu explains that the

phenomenal manifestations of the forces in the field take the form of 'psychological motivations such as love' suggesting that through their attitudes to marriage the characters may reveal more about the structural oppositions within the field of which they themselves may not be consciously aware.

Like the other main characters, Milvain's and Reardon's attitudes to writing can be seen mirrored in their attitudes to love.⁶⁵ Throughout his youth Reardon regarded the love of a woman as 'the prize of mortals supremely blessed', never considering himself to be one of those few winners (*NGS*, p. 95). In spite of his pessimism he fell in love with Amy and it was the type of love which once experienced he could not live without. Accordingly, once she had left him, no-one else could substitute and he reverted back to the 'monkish solitude' of his youth (*NGS*, p. 95). The literary life of Reardon follows a similar path. To begin with he feels that he has no talent for fiction writing and concentrates on more scholarly efforts. He has no 'native impulse' (*NGS*, p. 90) directing him to novel-writing and it is only the words and attendant wealth of a successful novelist that convince him to switch genre. Once he has written his first novel, however, he can be a slave to no other master. He is unable to return to his literary essays and his attempts at sensational short stories, a format enjoying unparalleled success at the time, are failures. If he cannot write novels to his own previous high standards, then he will no longer write.

In opposition to Reardon's idealised view of love, Milvain maintains that the 'days of romantic love are gone by' because the 'scientific spirit has put an end to that kind of self-deception' (*NGS*, p. 340). As a consequence, he admits that he will never feel strongly enough for anyone to make him 'lose sight of prudence and advantage' (*NGS*, p. 340) meaning, more explicitly, that he intends to marry for money. Thus, Milvain recognises that Marian is a 'danger' to him because he could easily fall in love with her despite her poor financial position. Money dominates over love in Milvain's world and, therefore, he is true to his character when he

breaks up with the struggling Marian in order to marry Amy and her inherited wealth. This marriage takes place not only because of Amy's new money, but because by this time Milvain has 'convinced himself that he cannot afford to despise anything that the world sanctions' (*NGS*, p. 514).

The narrative of *NGS* begins after the publication of Reardon's fourth novel, *On Neutral Ground*, but the facts of his earlier career are made known. Reardon's first writings were financed by his work as a secretary at the hospital, a position taken to offset starvation caused by his previous unsuccessful attempt to live solely from his literary work. It was in this state of relative comfort, provided by job security, that 'the impulse to literary production awoke in him stronger than ever' (*NGS*, p. 92). He wrote two books, the first published on the terms of half profits to the author, the second again on half profits, but this time with an advance of twenty-five pounds. Neither publication reaped any profits for the author, which meant that in three years his literary work had only amassed him twenty-five pounds.

While he was working on his third novel, Reardon's father died leaving him a legacy of four hundred pounds, allowing him to give up his administrative job altogether. His third novel sold for fifty pounds and the fourth for one hundred, and it was on the strength of these that he travelled to Europe and married Amy Yule. Unfortunately, even at this positive time, Reardon was aware that 'anything like the cares of responsibility would sooner or later harass him into unproductiveness' (*NGS*, p. 93) and the added expense of a wife and a child, soon vindicated this judgement.

Having given up his 'bread and butter' job, *NGS* plots Reardon's desperate, and latterly futile, attempts to make his literary work pay. It is not easy for a writer to enter the field of large-scale production if he holds beliefs which predispose him to the field of restricted production. Holbrook Jackson describes the 1890s as a 'battleground between *The Yellow Book* and the yellow press',⁶⁶ between the

individual and exotic of the minority periodical and the broad and general of the popular reprints of the classics. However Reardon is not an 'uncompromising artistic pedant', in fact he is 'quite willing to try and do the kind of work that will sell' (NGS, p. 81).

Reardon tries, in Bourdieu's words, to 'gamble at both tables', a process which risks 'losing everything by wanting to win everything' (*Rules*, p. 13). He would not mind if his work sold, that would not necessarily demerit it in his eyes, but equally, he is determined not to pursue popularity against his own judgement, being once proud of the fact that he had 'never written a line that was meant to attract the vulgar' (NGS, p. 82). The little reputation Reardon has is built upon symbolic, not financial criteria. His books were 'not the kind to win popularity' (NGS, p. 93):

they lacked local colour. Their interest was almost purely psychological. It was clear that the author had no faculty for constructing a story, and that the pictures of active life were not to be expected of him; he could never appeal to the multitude. But strong characterisation was within his scope, and an intellectual fervour, appetising to a small section of refined readers, marked all his best pages.

(NGS, p. 93)

He writes, in Milvain's words, 'nobly unremunerative work' (NGS, p. 360). *On Neutral Ground* was his most successful novel, receiving reviews that were 'generally favourable', but financially it brought him only one hundred pounds (NGS, p. 93).

Milvain tries to help Reardon achieve financial success for the first half of the novel. He suggests 'The Weird Sisters' as the title for a sensational short story because it would attract both 'the vulgar and the educated' (NGS, p. 107). Once finished it is rejected because it 'did not seem likely to please the particular audience' whom Jedwood, the publisher, was hoping to reach (NGS, p. 251). Reardon is even denied the cold comfort of symbolic reward because he is

humiliated when he thinks of the substandard quality of the story. Although it is 'not vulgar enough to please the worst' readers, more importantly it is 'too empty to please the better kind' (*NGS*, p. 251). In his attempt to please the majority, Reardon pleases no-one, least of all himself.

The principal opposition between the sub-fields of restricted and large-scale production is that while the former produces for a restricted audience of producers the latter creates for the larger audience of consumers. Jasper Milvain's principle is that a writer should 'answer a fool according to his folly; supply a simpleton with the reading he craves, if it will put money in your pocket' (*NGS*, p. 497), orientating himself, therefore, as the sub-field of large-scale production, towards the satisfaction of the demands of a wide audience (*Rules*, p. 121). While Reardon earns less money from each successive literary work, Milvain is seen gaining more financial reward as the novel progresses. He does not participate in Reardon's aesthetic discussions because as a literary man of the 1880s, he talks of 'literature as a trade, not of Homer, Dante, and Shakespeare' (*NGS*, p. 43).

Milvain is aware of a hierarchy within art, accepting the existence of both geniuses and tradesmen within the literary field, and in effect perpetuates the conflict between the two sub-fields. He realises that he does not possess genius and, that without it, attempting any form of high art would result in monetary ruin. For him the 'end of literary work - unless one is a man of genius - is to secure comfort and repute' (*NGS*, p. 356). This cynical temperament situates Milvain in the field of large-scale production and the profession which Gissing chooses for him is the epitome of this sub-field. In other words, Milvain joins the ranks of New Journalism. Its entrance into the sub-field at the end of the nineteenth century challenged the incumbent inhabitants in the same way that the decadents were mounting a challenge to those in the field of restricted production. If, as Peter McDonald suggests, Oscar Wilde is the historical 'master-purist of the 1890s', then Milvain must rate as the fictional 'master-profiteer'.⁶⁷

The development of New Journalism in the latter decades of the nineteenth century was not generally regarded by artists as a positive one. Milvain is a representation of the extreme forms which New Journalism could take, asserting that he will 'never write for writing's sake, only to make money', in contrast to Reardon who treasures the time when his 'work was done for its own sake' (*NGS*, pp. 150 & 234). The negative contemporary opinions of the new journalists are attested to by the appearance in *Macmillan's Magazine* of 'The Complete Leader-Writer (by Himself)' (1894). It is a satiric description by Walter Low of the characteristics which should be present in an ideal leader-writer. The principle criterion is that he must be young which, in itself, ensures a variety of attributes. First, he will not have developed the modesty that requires a practised journalist to hesitate 'over a puzzle which has been puzzling the wisest of statesmen of Europe for many years'.⁶⁸ Second, he will not be pained by the concept of writing against his beliefs and third, nor will he, as yet, have had to write many articles on the same topic. As a result of his youth he will happily accept anything which is assigned to him and may even have some original ideas, although 'the last case is not common' and is as 'dangerous as it is rare' (p. 360). Equally, Milvain warns Maud about the danger implicit in any originality when he discovers that one of her contributions to a women's magazine has 'rather too much thought in it' (*NGS*, p. 424). He assures her that the audience she is producing for are 'simply irritated, by anything that isn't glaringly obvious. They hate an unusual thought' (*NGS*, p. 424).

Low makes further demands on a Leader-Writer. For example, great emphasis is placed upon the amount of time that should be spent in research and composition. It would be a mistake to spend too much time researching in an attempt to attain the facts or a balanced argument because in journalism time is of paramount importance. The only unpardonable sin in New Journalism is to submit an article late, and consequently, the essential qualification is not to be able to

write, but to be able to write fast because the 'man who hesitates over Leader-Writing is lost' (p. 361).⁶⁹ Milvain is aware of New Journalism's demand for speed, lamenting that he took two hours to complete his article for the *Will o' the Wisp* when he could not 'afford more than an hour and a half for that job' (NGS, p. 213).

The impression left by 'The Complete Leader-Writer' is that a journalist at the end of the nineteenth century was seen as a person of questionable principles, little talent and no originality. However, New Journalism did have its merits. Even Arnold, while maintaining that New Journalism's 'one great fault is that it is *feather-brained*' recognised that it was also 'full of ability, novelty, variety, sensation, sympathy [and] generous instincts'.⁷⁰ The cutting criticism of the New Journalists by other writers in the field, of which 'The Complete Leader-Writer' and NGS are examples, arose partly as a result of the challenge they presented to the rôle of fiction writers and reputable journalists. Not only did their personalised journalism tend more towards fictional narratives than traditional reporting, but the public no longer had to rely on authors to open their eyes to social problems for they had the immediacy and intimacy of the newspapers. New Journalism was to give a voice to the newly literate, franchised audience and in that position assumed great power.

Whelpdale's concept for a magazine perfectly illustrates contemporary fears about the extremes which New Journalism could reach. The idea behind the magazine is that it is to address the 'quarter-educated', a potential new audience created by the education acts passed throughout the latter half of the nineteenth century. The governing principle for the publication is that no article is to measure more than two inches, with each inch divided into at least two paragraphs. The rationale behind this was that the new education acts had produced a public 'who can just read, but are incapable of sustained attention' (NGS, p. 496).⁷¹

Whelpdale's magazine is to contain what this new audience wants: 'bit of stories, bits of description, bits of scandal, bits of jokes, bit of statistics, bits of

foolery' (NGS, p. 496). The implication is that no attempt at comprehensive and extensively researched journalism will take place, with the underlying questions, how effective is a 'bit of a joke' or how misleading can a 'bit of a statistic' be? Once published it is revealed that *Chit-Chat*'s audience is not restricted to the quarter-educated it was aimed at, when it is seen being read by a 'class' of reader who would have once turned his eyes to more serious literature.

The power of the press depicted in *NGS* was welcomed by the leaders of New Journalism: W. T. Stead, H. W. Massington and T. P. O'Connor, editors of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, *The Daily Chronicle* and *The Star*, respectively. Stead, in his article 'The Future of Journalism' in *The Contemporary Review*, realised that an editor could become 'the most permanently influential Englishman in the Empire' and that the 'personal element' was indispensable 'for the proper development of a newspaper'.⁷² He advocated that the editor, or his assistants must have personal contact with anyone whose opinion carried any weight on the subject he wished to consider. Milvain was aware of this necessity, understanding that it was his job to 'know something about every subject - or to know where to get the knowledge' (NGS, p. 66). Moreover, the editor must be the 'master of public opinion',⁷³ proving that while other movements of the nineties were dependent on minority opinion, as the decadents and the feminists were, New Journalism relied on the majority.⁷⁴

Unfortunately, it was to this 'majority' audience and its tastes that some writers did not wish to appeal and there was a growing feeling that the distinctions between high art and low art were beginning to be eroded by the newspapers and miscellany magazines. The resentment that some writers had for the press can be understood not only in their own terms of artistic integrity but by the relative pecuniary rewards which they received. A journalist could be paid well for a piece of work which had no artistic claims, while a novelist could write well and be paid a pittance, a situation demonstrated by the varying fortunes of Milvain and Reardon.

While Reardon struggles to survive in the field of restricted production, Milvain is seen profiting from his position in the field of large-scale production. Milvain differs in attitude from those in the field of restricted production in three ways. First, he takes full advantage of all the opportunities which open up to him in the field through his use of contacts; second, he considers writing to be a profession which he can learn; and third, he writes for an audience which consumes rather than produces cultural products. Unlike Reardon, Milvain knows the importance of contacts in the new trade in literature and, more importantly, what a mistake it is to neglect anyone. Blame for the unfavourable reviews of Reardon's new novel is clearly shown to be Reardon's. He has no contact with the journalists and, moreover, he declines all Jasper's offers of introductions to parties where he could rectify the situation. Reardon would prefer to stay independent for as long as possible, only he has neither the money nor the talent to do so. Milvain knows that there are only a chosen few who can survive independently in the field of cultural production so, during any periods of 'enforced leisure', he builds up his list of acquaintances (*NGS*, p. 425). He becomes so adept at doing this that an exasperated Reardon finally asks, 'Who *don't* you know?' (*NGS*, p. 195).

In *NGS*, Jasper views literature as a trade which can be learnt, commenting that the fact that his sisters do not have 'any marked faculty' for literary work, does not mean they cannot enter the field of literary production because it is merely 'a question of learning a business' (*NGS*, p. 59). The particular openings which Milvain espies for them are either in religious writings or in the 'immense field there is for anyone who can just hit the taste of the new generation of Board school children' (*NGS*, p. 65). His awareness of prospective audiences and a willingness to construct his writing in order to attract them is alien to the field of restricted production. Indeed, his first commissioned article is to be about the typical readers of each of the principal papers, recognising the New Journalist's dependence on them.

Stead considers the important relationship between the editor of a journal and his prospective audience in his article 'Government by Journalism'. He insists that an editor must strive to keep his audience interested or 'the public will desert him for his rival across the street' and if they 'even for one week forget they had a paper, that paper would cease to exist'.⁷⁵ An editor relies on his audience, so an editor must know how his audience thinks and report accordingly. He elucidates his point by imagining the various ways in which some of the contemporary papers would react if an edict was issued ensuring that every woman in Lock Hospital would be vivisected at the medical schools for demonstration purposes:

The more decorous of our journals would deem the wrong scandalous enough to justify the insertion of a protest against so monstrous a violation of human rights. The medical journals of course would enthusiastically support it; *The Saturday Review* would empty the vials of its sourest ink over the indecent Mænads and shrieking sisters who publicly denounced such a outrage on humanity and womanhood; and the great majority of the papers would avoid the subject as much as possible, in the interests of public morality and public decency.⁷⁶

In effect, each paper would temper the story to their own readers, responding to a pre-existing demand, in pre-established forms. Bourdieu judges that the more 'directly or completely' an enterprise's product responds to these two demands, the closer it moves to the 'commercial pole' (*Rules*, p. 142). It is the knowledge and acceptance that there are different audiences which allows Milvain to select for whom he will write, in a manner which Reardon finds impossible. Reardon is shown to be totally ignorant of the contemporary readers he needs to please. He writes an article on Diogenes Laertius only to be informed by Amy that it will not sell, because 'whoever he was, the mass of readers will be frightened by his name' (*NGS*, p. 188).

Returning to the dual economy inherent in the field of literary production, Gissing does not actually portray the success which New Journalism reaps as being

of much worth, in his terms. Milvain explains that his 'writing is for to-day, most distinctly hodiernal. It has no value save in reference to to-day', failing, simultaneously to understand what value it would be to a writer 'if his work struggled to slow recognition ten years hence' (*NGS*, pp. 422 & 493). The immediate and transitory success available in the field of large-scale production, is in fact of significantly less worth to writers, like Reardon and Gissing, than the profits accumulated through long-term investment in symbolic value in the field of restricted production. When Whelpdale asserts that Reardon would have 'died more contentedly' if he had known people would continue to read and discuss his books, he acknowledges not only the value which Reardon placed on symbolic reward, but the irony that it often comes too late to be fully appreciated (*NGS*, p. 500-1). The problem, as ever, is maintaining a position in the field while waiting for the investment to mature. Positions within the field are not static, they are fought for and defended and therefore can be won and lost, which necessitates a brief look at the second opposition within the field's structure.

The second opposition within the field's objective structure involves the conflict between the 'consecrated' and the 'newcomers', which Bourdieu situates only in the sub-field of restricted production (*Field*, p. 53). However, Peter McDonald argues that while such internal disputes are particularly 'fierce and frequent' among the literary elite, 'generational struggles occur at every level of culture', and Gissing presents its happening within the sub-field of journalism.⁷⁷ Bourdieu explains that

When a new literary or artistic group makes its presence felt in the field [...] the whole problem is transformed, since its coming into being [...] modifies and displaces the universe of possible options; the previously dominant production may, for example, be pushed into the status either of outmoded [*déclassé*] or of classic works.

(*Field*, p. 32)

The introduction of new positions, like the advent of New Journalism or Symbolism in the 1890s, compelled incumbent position-holders to defend their positions, effecting change within the field. Bourdieu calls the '*series of positions* successively occupied by the same agent or the same group of agents in successive spaces' the 'social trajectory' of that agent (*Rules*, p. 258). The meaning of these biographical events can only be understood in relation to the 'successive states of the structure and distribution of different kinds of capital in play in the field' (*Rules*, p. 158). Bourdieu warns against trying to understand any career as a unique and self-sufficient series of successive events. He argues that to do so:

without any other link than association with a 'subject' [. . .] is almost as absurd as trying to make sense of a trip on the metro without taking the structure of the network into account, meaning the matrix of objective relations between the different stations.

(*Rules*, p. 259)

Change is the result of the constant conflict which is fundamental to the functioning of the literary field. Reardon's work no longer accumulated any recognition nor any financial reward which would allow him to remain as an active competitor in the field. He laments that while Milvain basks in the 'sunshine of success', he is 'not even capable of holding such position as he had gained' (*NGS*, p. 256). The unstable nature of dominance is shown in the implied warning that Milvain's dominant position within the sub-field of large-scale production carries no guarantee against the next 'generation'.

Although, for the duration of the book Milvain gains more and more success, the parallel fortunes of Alfred Yule serve as a warning against complacency in dominance, which Milvain fails to hear. Alfred Yule's early career and attitude as a young writer is presented as similar to Milvain's present outlook. He entered the field as a bookseller, but 'already ambition devoured him' (*NGS*, p. 123). Moving from a contributor, to sub-editor and eventually to director of a periodical, he left

bookselling and began his literary career. Like Milvain, he had to work hard because 'nature had not favoured him with brilliant parts' and any truthful account of the amount he had written between the ages of 25 and 30, the age that Milvain is currently, 'would have looked like a burlesque of exaggeration' (*NGS*, p. 123). The quantity of work reflected the ambition he had 'to become a celebrated man' (*NGS*, p. 123).

The entry of New Journalism, however, changed the face of journalism during Alfred's lifetime and the 'scholarly' articles he wrote were now not so popular and, therefore, not so valuable in monetary terms. He is the image of a journalist, once successful in the field of large-scale production, who cannot fight off new and younger opponents, a situation which may eventually happen to Milvain. He will only remain a success for as long as New Journalism remained popular. The struggle within the field is one in which the occupants of different positions devise strategies to 'defend or improve their positions' (*Field*, p. 30). While Reardon and Alfred are examples of the failure to defend a position, being unwillingly moved, Whelpdale can be viewed as a character, who as one of the 'new generation' of journalists, improves his economic position throughout the book at Alfred's cost.

Whelpdale believes that there 'may be thousands of women' whom he could love with equal sincerity. He is neither the mercenary that Milvain is, yet nor does he believe in the romantic ideal of love for which Reardon suffers (*NGS*, p. 339). His adaptability and spirit of compromise in aspects of love are equally apparent in his attitude towards writing. Both attributes allow him to move out of his initial place in the field of restricted production and become even more successful in the field of large-scale production than Milvain. He can serve under any literary banner as long as he has some degree of 'preference' for it, in the same way that he can fall in love with many women with 'equal sincerity'.

Whelpdale is the only character in the book who makes the transition from struggling artist in the field of restricted production, to economically successful, literary businessman in the field of large-scale production. He has the breeding of a gentleman, and a temperament which is both 'sentimental' and 'shrewd' (NGS, p. 295). Added to that he has a literary intellect to equal Reardon's. In the beginning he is spoken of in a manner reminiscent of Reardon, in that an earlier novel he had written was not a complete failure, but his latest book had been refused because it had 'no market value' despite its 'considerable merit' (NGS, p. 177).

He initially becomes a literary advisor, which involves two stages. First, he begins by advising young writers on anything ranging from selecting a suitable choice of subject to making a recommendation to a publisher. It is Jasper who notes the irony in a 'man who can't get anyone to publish his own books' making 'a living by telling other people how to write!' (NGS, p. 195).⁷⁸ Second, he decides to publish an Author's Guide of the type appearing at the end of the nineteenth century.

By taking on the rôle of literary advisor Whelpdale has transformed his position in the field. Having recognised how to make money from the field, he is now working entirely to meet the demands of an audience with little regard for symbolic value: he has moved from the sub-field of restricted production to that of large-scale. He further consolidates his new position by joining the ranks of New Journalism. Making use of his contacts within the field, he is offered a column in *Chat*, the form of which confirms how far he has travelled in the field. It is to be a general information column which not only requires an audience to read it, but needs readers to participate in it by asking questions. Indeed, it is an embodiment of the field he now occupies; his work is now purely reactive and, therefore, cannot exist without the public. By the time he meets Dora, therefore, Whelpdale is no longer a poverty-stricken author but someone whose manual has sold over 600 copies and can be rightly deemed a 'dealer in literary advice', a title referring

both to his literary advisorship and to the advice he gives in his column (*NGS*, p. 304). He eventually becomes sub-editor of *Chit-Chat*, achieving Milvain's strived-for position before him, because success seems to breed success.

Whelpdale's enterprises in literary advice bring him into contact with others who are financially dominant in the sub-field and, as a result, he is offered the post of literary agent for Fleet & Co. With this final transition, Gissing introduces another new position entering the field in the 1880s, the force of which was seen alternatively as a blessing or a curse to the current occupants. The literary agent was a by-product of the growing commercialisation in the late nineteenth century of the literary world and a position as much defended by the Society of Authors as it was chastised by publishers. A look at a couple of articles in *The Nineteenth Century* indicates the differing opinions in 1895 surrounding the advent of the literary agent.

In November, T. Werner Laurie wrote, 'Author, Agent and Publisher. By One of "The Trade" ', within which he criticised the literary agent as a parasite seeking the greatest price for himself, not the author. Furthermore, he considered the Society of Authors' advocacy of them as an attack on publishers, a criticism attacked in December, by the founder of the society, Walter Besant. Besant justified the existence of literary agents by arguing that they were not corrupt but rather, that they acted like a good solicitor, maintaining rights and defending property with terms honourable on both sides.

Besant argued that there was actually a need for agents, because to produce 'a successful novelist' a novel now had to:

- appear as a serial.
- if possible, appear simultaneously serialised in Great Britain, America, Canada, Africa, Australia and India.
- appear in book form, which necessitates arranging for British, American and Continental rights.
- have translation rights and rights to dramatisation.⁷⁹

So far had the literary world been commercialised by 1895, reasoned Besant, that a writer could not be expected to create and deal with all of the legalities as well. Gissing was not entirely against this aspect of commercialism, and in fact had noticed with admiration that Dickens was indeed a very shrewd businessman. The changes, however, brought all sections of the literary 'field' into conflict as Bourdieu illustrated it should; publishers with agents, agents with writers, artists with other artists, the press with artists, artists with critics and it is this conflict which *NGS* highlights.

Whelpdale, by turning his back on his own literature becomes the most successful character, in commercial terms, in the story by taking full advantage of the opportunities opening up in the literary field, with each successive position being more economically dominant than the last. In his character, Gissing created someone who chooses to take advantage of the range of movement between the possible positions open to him; someone who can most effectively 'play the field'.

NGS: Inherited Conflicts

In order to achieve a 'rigorous science of the production of cultural goods', Bourdieu argues that the idea of the writer as an uncreated creator must be challenged. It is this belief in the charismatic ideology of the 'creation' which both 'directs the gaze towards the apparent producer - painter, composer, writer - and prevents us from asking who created this "creator"' (*Rules*, p. 167). In this way 'any enquiry beyond the artist and the artist's own activity' is avoided and Bourdieu's sociological objectives remain unattained.

Although I have shown that in *NGS* Gissing offers a diagnostic description of the field, Gissing is not a sociologist. Rather than fully deconstructing the positions he reveals in line with the sociological principles of Bourdieu, Gissing proceeds to remystify the categories. While Bourdieu maintains that the two extremes within

the field - either total and cynical subordination to demand or absolute independence from the market and its exigencies - 'are never, in fact, attained', Gissing presents the readers with two such extremes in the characters of Milvain and Biffen (*Rules*, p. 141-2).

Having presented Milvain as the embodiment of the sub-field of large-scale production in a diagnostic reading, closer examination of the text reveals author ambivalence rather than condemnation of this journalist. Gissing's own opinion of journalism was equally non-committal. On the one hand it was not what he wanted to occupy his time with, but on the other he was pleased to recommend it to friends.

Gissing could easily have become a successful journalist because he had what Milvain realised was crucial for success in the literary field; he had contacts. Through his association with Frederic Harrison he met John Morley and was approached by both to write more than the couple of articles he did for them. Harrison's son, Austin, wrote after Gissing's death:

We implored him to write again. But Gissing refused. He hated editors; he was no journalist, he said; he could not degrade himself by such 'trash'. In truth any time after 1882 Gissing could have obtained a place as a critic or a writer on some journal [. . .] but Gissing declined to 'serve'.⁸⁰

Gissing's personal antagonism towards writing for journals is traceable to his experience as a contributor to *Le Messager de l'Europe*. Gissing had started writing for Turgenev's Russian periodical in January 1881 but Jacob Korg explains that the amount of work which he put into each article had become intolerable.⁸¹ Accordingly, November 1882 saw the last issue of that quarterly to contain a 'Correspondence from London' by Gissing.

By 1889, however, Gissing is advising Bertz to accept a position as a proprietor and if possible as editor of a periodical. He assuages that, 'it would put your mind at ease in a way you have never hitherto known. And what sterling

work you would do! What a sphere of influence you would make for yourself! Press on with this undertaking, I beg you'.⁸² It would be the mark of success which Reardon highlights in that it would represent the ability to 'dictate literary opinions to the universe' (*NGS*, p. 196). It is a position that Gissing did not feel was possible for himself, yet he saw the advantages for others.

At times the authorial attitude to Milvain as an individual verges on admiration. Although he takes advantage of the growth in the field, like Gissing Milvain is no democrat. He explains to his sister:

I don't advocate the propagation of vicious literature; I speak only of good, coarse, marketable stuff for the world's vulgar [. . .]. I maintain that we people of brains are justified in supplying the mob with the food it likes.

(*NGS*, p. 43)

It is interesting that the derogatory classification of the new democratic and literate audience, more appropriate in the sub-field of restricted production, is communicated through this 'master-profitier'. David Grylls suggests that although sharing in the general contempt for the 'anonymous audience' Jasper also wishes to exploit it and it may be his ability to do so which Gissing admires.⁸³

As highlighted earlier, Gissing's personal letters reveal an attitude similar to Milvain, that is one which perpetuates rather than seeks to diminish the distance between the two sub-fields. In the year in which *NGS* was published Ibsen's 'Hedda Gabler' was premiering in London. Gissing writes that it is 'worse that idle to present anything original to the mob of London playgoers', a category set up in opposition to the 'intellectual people'.⁸⁴ A more scathing attack was precipitated by the 'mass of foreigners', especially English, whom he encountered on his visit to the Vatican in 1889. He wrote to Bertz:

Impossible to describe the vulgarity of most of these people. Many of them are absolute shop-boys & work-girls. How in heaven's name do they get the money to come here? And where are the good cultured people? And how it enrages one to think of the numbers of those who *could* make noble use of this opportunity, if only it were granted them. - Every day I saw people whom I should have liked to have assaulted. What business have these gross animals in such places?⁸⁵

When Milvain states that for him the 'end of literary work - unless one is a man of genius - is to secure comfort and repute', he is doing more than merely propounding his own philosophy (*NGS*, p. 356). He perpetuates the myth that there are artists - geniuses - who work for other reasons. In fact in all his actions he assumes the presence of the field of restricted production as a revered place which he cannot enter because he does not have the required attributes, thus contributing to the remystification of the 'author'.

Milvain as a profiteer with no democratic spirit, is presented as occupying a position of 'cynical subordination' to market demands. He consciously positions himself in the position in which he speculates he will gain the most financial reward, while negatively avowing the existence of the artist who suffers for his art. A more compelling example of Gissing's remystification of the author, however, is in his portrayal of art in general, and the character of Biffen specifically. In the first instance the book promotes the transcendent aspects of art, as Gissing had done in an early philosophical article. In 'The Hope of Pessimism' (1882), he states that:

There is, in truth, only one kind of worldly optimism which justifies itself in the light of reason, and that is the optimism of the artist [. . .]. In the mood of artistic contemplation the will is destroyed, self is eliminated, the world of phenomena resolves itself into pictures of absolute significance and the heart rejoices itself before images of pure beauty.⁸⁶

Gissing lets the suffering Reardon glimpse this aesthetic haven in *NGS*, allowing him to understand that the 'best moments in life are when we contemplate beauty in the purely artistic spirit' (*NGS*, p. 405).

Gissing attests to the healing powers of literature through the constant references to the pleasure of reading literature throughout the novel. The important part that literature plays in life is mainly reflected in Reardon, who finds 'rare joy' in the noble hexameters of Homer (*NGS*, p. 155). First, reading is shown to solve the arguments between Reardon and Amy, albeit momentarily. A quarrel ends with Reardon reading from the *Odyssey* and, in 'a few minutes it was as if no difficulties threatened their life' (*NGS*, p. 158). Second, there is the ability which the discussion of literature has to lift Biffen and Reardon from their poverty and into a 'world where the only hunger known could be satisfied by grand or sweet cadences' (*NGS*, p. 172). Books are given the power to allow readers to escape from drudgery into a consolatory world created through art, and the significance of this to the authors in *NGS* is expressed by the value they place on their libraries. Reardon could tell where and when he had purchased each book, making it particularly hard for him to part with the volumes he considered as 'dear old friends' (*NGS*, p. 170).

The importance of reading is ultimately illustrated by the consideration of Reardon after his departure, in his creative capacity, from the literary field. Although the thought of writing still filled him with dread, it is shown that:

In time, however, he was able to read. He had pleasure in contemplating the little collection of sterling books that alone remained to him from his library; the sight of many volumes would have been a weariness, but these few - when he was again able to think of books at all - were as friendly countenances. He could not read continuously, but sometimes he opened his Shakespeare, for instance, and dreamed over a page or two. From such glimpses there remained in his head a line or a short passage, which he kept repeating to himself [. . .] which had a soothing effect upon him.

(*NGS*, p. 376)

The literature which has these healing powers, however, is limited to the 'classics', thus constituting an attack upon the contemporary field and adding to the sense of nostalgia which permeates the novel.

The individual libraries of Biffen and Reardon contain only Homer, Sophocles, Shakespeare and authors of similar stature, and it was the 'old writers' who gave Reardon 'such strength to him in his days of misery' (NGS, p. 96). Again it is Milvain who attacks the growth in commercialisation when he explains that the likelihood of the field, as it stood, producing such works is minimal. He claims that as a result of the system of mass production 'the growing flood of literature swamps everything but works of primary genius. If a clever and conscientious book does not spring to success at once, there's precious chance that it will survive' (NGS, p. 493).⁸⁷ Gissing had commented upon, what he perceived to be, the current decline in the quality of literature even within the nineteenth century. In a letter to his brother, Algernon he wrote:

Our great men are Besant, Haggard, Stevenson & Hall Caine, - noble catalogue, upon my word! No one wishes to deny that there is a measure of skill & literary aptitude in such men, but they lack the quality of *distinction*; they have no leading power, no originality of nature; they are not personalities. - Compare the time with that when each day expected a book from Thackeray, or Dickens, or Charlotte Bronte.⁸⁸

The hostile state of the field does not, however, prevent Gissing from portraying, in Biffen, an autonomous artist who exists apparently completely independent of the contemporary market exigencies.

Reardon is not the only writer in NGS to function in the sub-field of restricted production; present throughout his suffering is Harold Biffen. Both are writers whose personalities are deemed by the narrator to be 'wholly unfitted for the rough and tumble of the world's labour market' (NGS, p. 462), but Biffen is alone in his total 'denegation of the "economy" ', because Gissing makes the pursuit of money a main preoccupation for all the other characters, including Reardon. They are all

linked by John Yule's will and interested in the effect that a legacy would have upon them: it would mean that Marian and Milvain could marry without Milvain damaging his career prospects; it may have saved the marriage of Reardon and Amy if it had come earlier; and Alfred hoped it would have revived his career by financing a new periodical.

Biffen is an idealised artist, without inherited wealth, who is nevertheless happy to remain in the field of restricted production. With an 'educated accent', 'cultivated mind and a graceful character' (*NGS*, pp. 464 & 171), at no time does he wish for any commercial recognition, asserting that to finish his work will be reward enough. Instead of a desire for money, Biffen has a desire to write. He wants to write something new; he wants to achieve 'absolute Realism in the sphere of the ignobly decent' (*NGS* p. 173). Accordingly, he can also be seen, as Peter Keating highlights, as the representative of contemporary writing. He is the only person writing 'experimental fiction, and he alone seems to possess an acquaintanceship with the work of some of the great nineteenth-century novelists'.⁸⁹

When writing, Biffen has no occasion to consider whether 'such toil would be recompensed in coin of the realm'. He prefers to use his time to struggle over every line until each sentence is as good as he can make it, 'harmonious to the ear, with words of precious meaning skilfully set' (*NGS*, p. 463). In spite of this effort, he is aware that his work will make little or no money because it will be repulsive to the public. For Biffen all that matters is that the 'work must be significant' (*NGS*, p. 463).

In *Thyrza* (1887), Gilbert Grail introduces Thyrza to the pleasures of reading. Gissing presents her as a girl so limited in knowledge about books that:

It had never occurred to her that any special interest could attach to the people who wrote them; indeed she had perhaps never asked herself how printed matter came into existence. Even among the crowd of average readers we know how commonly a book will be run through without a glance at its title-page.⁹⁰

An analysis of the title-page for the first edition of *NGS* illustrates how the text participates in a set of economic practices rejected by the novel at the level of mere content (*Fig. 1*). In other words, while Gissing can present a character, with no inherited wealth, who can function in the field while negating all market concerns, Gissing as an actual participant in the field, and his novel as a product thereof, could not.

The marketing strategies for an author's name varied. Smith, Elder had published *Demos* anonymously in an attempt to emphasise its controversiality. As Halperin suggests, they wished to imply that 'the author was a personage of some importance who was reticent about putting his name to such a topical book'.⁹¹ By 1891 it was more profitable to trade under, if not further commodify, his now established name. The title-page to the first edition, therefore, presents George Gissing as the 'author of "The Nether World" "Demos" etc'.

The presentation of Gissing as 'author of' *The Nether World* and *Demos* was further supplemented by an advertisement at the end of volume, welcomed by Gissing, which listed all the novels for which Smith, Elder held the copyright.⁹² This type of dual advertising, whereby one publication endorsed another to the benefit of both, was becoming increasingly popular and Gissing reflects upon it in *NGS*. Milvain delays publishing his article 'The Novels of Edwin Reardon' to coincide with the reprinting of the novels for maximum exposure. However, while the author may get his name known, it is the publishing company which retains the profits, because at the bottom of the title-page are the words 'All rights reserved'.

Even the typography used on this title-page presents Gissing as a product of Smith, Elder. A brief look at the title page to *The White Company* by Conan Doyle, also published by Smith, Elder in 1891, is all that is required to see the identical page layout, type face and marketing strategies. In this case Conan Doyle is subtitled, 'Author of 'Micah Clarke'', and again all rights are reserved.⁹³

NEW GRUB STREET

A NOVEL

BY

GEORGE GISSING

AUTHOR OF 'THE NETHER WORLD' 'DEMOS' ETC.

IN THREE VOLUMES

VOL. I.

LONDON

SMITH, ELDER, & CO., 15 WATERLOO PLACE

1891

All rights reserved

Figure 1: Title-page to the first edition of *New Grub Street* (London: Smith, Elder, 1891).

These ominous words reflect that many of the problems concerning authorial payment expounded in the novel are fulfilled by the factual history of *NGS*'s publication. Walter Besant was fighting for better conditions of pay for authors at this time through his work with the Society of Authors and, therefore, by the end of the century there was an alternative to the outright sale of copyright or half-profits: the system of royalties. However, as Reardon insists, it was still a buyer's market and only those who had proved their work to be profitable could really take advantage of the new scheme. Disparaging the sale of his copyright for the 'paltry' sum of three hundred pounds, Amy asks Reardon to consider how much Markland sold his book for. He admits, 'Didn't sell it at all, ten to one. Gets a royalty' (*NGS*, p. 158). Those with less reputation still had to be content with half-profits, at best.

The most vulnerable writers were those who simply did not have the means to scorn short-term financial gain and wait for the future rewards that royalties or half-profits may have accumulated for them. They still succumbed to selling the copyright outright for the sake of badly needed cash. It is the position to which Reardon has fallen with *Margaret Home*, and Halperin describes it as Gissing's position when he submitted *NGS*'s manuscript to Smith, Elder. He had no money and no idea how much he could obtain for the book and, consequently, is a paradigm of the type of ignorance which Besant was campaigning to obliterate. He sold all the rights for one hundred and fifty pounds. Halperin opines that, 'unfortunately Gissing could not afford to refuse this offer - "unfortunately" because once again he would have done better financially with a royalty arrangement. He was never to earn any real monetary rewards from this great book - never earn a penny from cheap reprints or translation rights'.⁹⁴ Worse still he took this opportunity to sell the copyright of *Thyrza*, the only book which he had not sold outright, for £10. Thus Smith, Elder, like any publisher, could construct 'Gissing as author' around the texts for which they held all the rights.

The title-page stamps the text with signs of its commerciality and in this respect the final words which necessitate attention are, 'in three volumes'. Biffen's lack of regard for money and the public is epitomised by the format in which he chooses to publish his novel. He casually mentions that *Mr Bailey Grocer* will be published in 'one volume, of course; the length of the ordinary French novel' (*NGS*, p. 244). The French novel of the 1880s may have usually appeared in only one volume, but it remained an extraordinary occurrence in Britain.

Through his circulating libraries, Mudie's influence over the publishing trade was still great until the mid-1890s. His control over the book world did not just cover the content, but also the form of books. Since its inception in 1842 the library's preference for novels in three volumes had ensured that it became the 'inevitable form' of fiction.⁹⁵ If a novelist created a book in less than three volumes, it risked omission from the libraries and thus was seldom accepted by publishers. Consequently, by the mid-1890s the 'triple-decker' had become unpopular amongst writers and defences of it only appeared in magazines which were owned by publishers.⁹⁶ It was in the interests of the publishers to try to shape, and in this instance maintain, the production of culture in the manner which was most advantageous to them. The collapse of Mudie's power came in 1894 when the terms of acceptance were redefined, a change for which authors had been fighting for some time. One of the most significant aspects was that the lending library was forced to change its attitude towards three-volume books. The result was that in 1897 only four three volume novels were published, compared with 184 in 1894.⁹⁷

The contemporary antagonism towards the manipulation of authors by institutions like Mudie's, is fictionalised in *NGS* in a conversation between Milvain and Reardon. It is described as a 'well-worn topic' when Jasper initiates a discussion about the 'triple-headed monster, sucking the blood of [the] English novelist' (*NGS*, p. 235). Reardon explains that, for 'anyone in his position', there are two reasons why it is impossible to abandon the three-volume format (*NGS*, p.

236). One, he would inevitably lose the benefit of the libraries, which 'from the commercial point of view [. . .] are indispensable' and two, he would have to write four one-volume novels to obtain equal income (*NGS*, p. 236).

Authors, in order to produce enough material to fill three volumes, often resorted to conversations and side-stories, illustrated by the revelation that Reardon kept 'as much as possible to dialogue' because it filled the space 'much more quickly' (*NGS*, p. 154). The detrimental effect which these padding techniques had upon literature is implied when Milvain judges that Reardon's *Margaret Home* would have done him credit had it been cut down to one volume. The fact that Biffen consciously chooses to publish a one-volume novel in these circumstances is an indication of his rare independence from economic pressures in the field. The fact that Gissing felt compelled to publish the novel in three volumes is more in line with Bourdieu's argument that it is normally only those with other forms of income who can afford such displays.

In 1891, unlike Biffen, Gissing was still influenced by external, and predominantly material, demands, appearing to be as much a victim of the Victorian 'padding' conventions as Reardon. Clearly, through Reardon, Gissing acknowledges the problems for authors in general terms, and Bernard Bergonzi asserts that he was also aware of his own identical failings in *NGS*. Not only does Bergonzi suggest that the book is flawed by the 'excess of thinly spun conversation', but points to the fact that when given the opportunity to re-draft the novel for a French translation, Gissing ensured that much of the conversational material was cut.⁹⁸

It is not only in the format and terms of publication, however, that *NGS* as a text contradicts the vision of the artist presented in the novel by Biffen. Writing about Gissing, Halperin concludes:

Most of his novels are the carefully plotted three-deckers of the Victorian heyday, full of guilty secrets, family disasters, lost wills, hidden identities, and clandestine marriages, with appropriate attention paid to the feelings and prejudices of Mudie subscribers.⁹⁹

An early Gissing novel had suffered at the hands of the so-called 'Mudie subscribers'. *Mrs Grundy's Enemies* was accepted by Bentley's at the end of 1882, but despite accepting many excisions determined by the publisher in order to placate its intended audience, it was never produced. However, nearly ten years had passed and Gissing was aware that as his reputation grew so did his degree of autonomy. By 1889 he could write to Bertz that, 'Bentley made no kind of moral objection to "The Emancipated." If it had been by an unknown man, he would have objected - I am sure - to twenty things in it'.¹⁰⁰

In *New Grub Street*, Gissing's lack of pure independence from market demands manifests itself in his reliance on stock techniques. The novel has been described as Gissing's *The Way We Live Now*, a book in which Trollope explores the 'collapse of standards of social order before new methods of finance'.¹⁰¹ They share opening chapters which concern a wayward son returning to his mother to acquire financial support. In the earlier novel Felix Carbury disturbs his mother who was 'rarely disturbed by her daughter', to request twenty pounds, because 'a fellow can't live without some money in his pocket'.¹⁰² While it does not suggest that Gissing had even read this book, and indeed as a writer he did not rate Trollope, it does indicate that they may both have been working from the same Victorian tradition. With his attendant move in *The Emancipated* and *New Grub Street*, away from the working-class, Gissing is tending towards the ideal subject-matter for a popular novel suggested by Whelpdale.¹⁰³

Reardon cannot write a sensational short story, even if he tries, while Biffen does not even want to try. However, along with the fortuitous will and compelling marriage themes, parts of *NGS* tend towards sensational realism. In his critical work, Gissing castigates Dickens for the scene in *Oliver Twist* where Sikes flees

his pursuers as an example of using 'the motives of standard melodrama on a contemporary subject'.¹⁰⁴ Yet at the same time, does Biffen's heroic rooftop escape with his manuscript, not owe something to Sikes own flight from death? Two men in desperate situations must fight for their lives in episodes where dramatic tension has been carefully built up. Biffen makes the correlation when he thinks, 'I am a dead man [. . .] and all for the sake of "Mr Bailey, Grocer"' (NGS, p. 466-7). Each ends up on the roof of a house with no obvious means of escape, having to rely on the 'stack of chimneys'.¹⁰⁵

The contents of Biffen's novel would not have included such an incident. The driving force behind Biffen's novel is that it will depict real life, 'the true story of Mr Bailey's marriage and of his progress as a grocer' (NGS, p. 244) and it is with conscious irony that Reardon writes asking Biffen to bring a new chapter of his 'exhilarating romance' (NGS, p. 389). When *Mr. Bailey, Grocer* finally appears it is criticised because it does not fulfil the most important criteria; it does not tell a story and it does not amuse. One critic is quoted as calling it 'another of those intolerable productions for which we are indebted to the spirit of grovelling Realism' (NGS, p. 522).

Biffen appears to be above economic concerns and influences and is thus idealised. Although 'he did not starve for the pleasure of the thing', pupils were difficult to attract and he had no intention of changing his writing merely to obtain enough money to eat (NGS, p. 463). In cases of emergency he could apply to his brother for money, but he did so infrequently. In other words, he was content to exist in the field of restricted production, without any money and the only explanation offered for this contentment is that he had 'the right fire' in him (NGS, p. 244). As a character, he perpetuates the myth that an artist can be fed by his art, an illusion which not only Gissing's own text as a product of the literary field disproves, but which Gissing himself realised was idealised. In October 1890 he wrote to Eduard Betz to tell him he had started writing NGS. He confessed that he

had 'finished the first volume, & *must* complete the thing before Christmas, for I am all but penniless [. . .] I must consider nothing but mere physical needs'.¹⁰⁶

On the opening page of *NGS*, Maud is complaining about Milvain's complacent attitude towards the news that a man was being hanged in London at that very moment. Justifying his confession that there was a 'certain satisfaction in reflecting that it is not oneself', he explains:

Well [. . .] seeing that the fact came into my head what better use could I make of it? I could curse the brutality of an age that sanctioned such things; or I could grow doleful over the misery of the poor-fellow. But these emotions would be as little profitable to others as to myself. It just happened that I saw the thing in a light of consolation. Things might be bad with me, but not so bad as *that*.

(*NGS*, p. 35)

This could also be read as Gissing's justification for producing *NGS*. The novel is a product of the conflict which commercialisation of the literary trade was precipitating in the literary field at the end of the nineteenth century and reflects Gissing's experience of the changing field and its effect upon its various participants. He knew that many people were profiting from the commercial change and demonstrates that he knew how it could be done, but he was equally aware of what he perceived to be the danger it presented to literature. John Goode laments that the articulated values introduced in the opening chapters 'leads us to expect a conflict which never emerges', instead what is presented is 'the struggle of the literary producer to secure himself a living'.¹⁰⁷ Gissing does not condemn Milvain or Reardon, nor is the book bitter in tone, he seems rather to be merely presenting the state of the field in terms of consolation. Considering the field from an existing position within it, Gissing can assert that things might be bad for him,

but not as bad as any of the positions he presents. However, it is as a participant that Gissing cannot fully deconstruct the positions he reveals.

Gissing is a novelist and Bourdieu is a sociologist. While Gissing's work can be used by sociologists to investigate the field, it was not Gissing's intention. Gissing is a mythmaker, and his book concludes with the unresolvable tragic position of the artist in conflict with commerce, while Bourdieu is a demythologiser who seeks to offer a total diagnosis of the field. Both are, however, acts of containment, bearing within them fundamental conflicts. It is clear that Gissing's text is a production of whole field of cultural production despite his insistence on the autonomy of the artist. He cannot escape from the field which he inhabits.

He depicts two extreme positions within the field: Biffen is in the sub-field of restricted production functioning in terms of a reversed economy and Milvain is in the sub-field of large-scale production prospering under normal economic principles. As exaggerations they are particularly effective in introducing the principle conflict within the field of cultural production, but Bourdieu maintains that these two extremes within the field do not exist (*Rules*, p. 141-2). The next chapter compares the situations faced by two writers often presented as holding such extreme positions. Questioning the validity of the positions generally attributed to Henry James and Walter Besant, it provides a closer investigation of the dual economy at the heart of the field of literary production.

Endnotes: Chapter Two

¹ Pierre Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*, ed. by Randal Johnson (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1993), p. 31. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text marked, *Field*.

² Thomas Carlyle, *On Heroes, Hero-Worship and the Heroic in History* [1840] (London: Chapman and Hall, 1872), p. 148.

³ Peter D. McDonald, *British Literary Culture and Publishing Practice, 1880-1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 14.

⁴ McDonald, p. 10.

⁵ George Gissing, 'The Place of Realism in Fiction' in George Gissing, *Selections Autobiographical and Imaginative from the Works of George Gissing*, biographical and critical notes by A. C. Gissing, intro. by Virginia Woolf (London: Jonathan Cape, 1929), (pp. 219-20).

⁶ George Gissing, *Charles Dickens, A Critical Study* (London: Blackie & Son, 1929), p. 43. Further references to this book are given after quotations in the text.

⁷ Ruth Capers Mackay, 'Gissing as a Portrayer of Society' (1933), in *Collected Articles on George Gissing*, ed. by Pierre Coustillas (London: Frank Cass, 1967), p. 42.

⁸ Paul F. Mattheissen, Arthur C. Young, Pierre Coustillas, eds., *The Collected Letters of George Gissing*, 9 vols. (Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1990-1997), IV (1993), p. 196.

⁹ McDonald, p. 10.

¹⁰ Gillian Tindall, *The Born Exile: George Gissing* (London: Temple Smith, 1974) p. 41.

¹¹ Tindall, p. 44.

¹² George Gissing, *George Gissing's Commonplace Book*, ed. by Jacob Korg (New York: New York Public Library, 1962), p. 23/4. John Halperin points out that as well as *not* associating with other tradesmen, Thomas Gissing chose his own friends 'from among the professional classes' in *Gissing, A Life in Books* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982), p. 12.

¹³ Halperin, p. 5.

¹⁴ Tindall, p. 49 & 10. A report of 'Mr. Gissing at Home' in *The Academy*, vol. 53, 1898 states that he 'received the ordinary education of the middle-class English boy, stopping short of university'. Naturally the 'secret' as to why his education had abruptly stopped was not yet common knowledge. He was expelled from his college having been caught stealing. As Tindall suggests the shame of this was due to the 'working class aspects' of crime. As eldest son he carried all the family's social aspirations and the crime he had committed was 'out of keeping with the class with which the whole Gissing household fervently wished to be associated', p. 130.

¹⁵ Tindall, p. 47.

¹⁶ He argues that 'the educational market is strictly dominated by the linguistic products of the dominant class' and therefore perpetuates its very dominance in Pierre Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power*, ed. by John B. Thompson, trans. by Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson (Cambridge: Polity, 1991), p. 62. Further references to linguistic acquisition are taken from this text and are given after quotations in the text.

¹⁷ Tindall, p. 51. Taken from George Gissing, 'Reminiscences of my Father', an unpublished manuscript in Yale, Tindall quotes, 'He was very refined in his choice of words, never anything from his lips approaching coarseness or vulgarity. He liked to nicely discriminate certain words, e.g. Tart and Pie'.

¹⁸ Gissing, *Commonplace Book*, p. 62.

- ¹⁹ George Gissing, *London and the Life of Literature in Late Victorian England: The Diary of George Gissing*, ed. by Pierre Coustillas (Sussex: Harvester, 1978), p. 237.
- ²⁰ Michael Collie, *George Gissing: A Biography* (Folkestone: Dawson, 1977), p. 123.
- ²¹ Tindall describes *The Nether World* as 'his last low-life novel', p. 14; Coustillas terms it the 'last of his low-life novels', *The Critical Heritage* p. 21; Collie represents *The Nether World* as the 'last in the series' (including *Thyrza* and *Demos*) which represents Gissing's 'developing thought on realism', p. 80.
- ²² Jacob Korg, *George Gissing: A Critical Biography* (London: Methuen, 1963), p. 33; *Critical Heritage*, p. 10. Gissing paid 'Remington £50 at the time of signing, £40 when the first two volumes had been printed and the remaining £35 when the third volume had been printed', Collie, p. 50.
- ²³ *Collected Letters of George Gissing*, I, (1990), p. 282.
- ²⁴ Tindall, p. 13. The following details are taken from her 'Digest Biography'.
- ²⁵ *Collected Letters of George Gissing*, IV, p. 111.
- ²⁶ Halperin, p. 89. As Halperin explains although *Demos* was the third novel published by Gissing, it was actually the seventh one he had written, p. 74.
- ²⁷ Halperin, p. 66.
- ²⁸ Halperin, p. 81.
- ²⁹ Halperin, p. 154.
- ³⁰ Statistics taken from Halperin, p. 154. Gissing turned down this first proposal.
- ³¹ Letters, IV, p. 295.
- ³² In 'The Place of Realism in Fiction' Gissing remarked that those unfortunate enough to be categorised as 'realists' were also thought to 'propound a theory of life, by preference known as "pessimism"', *Selections*, p. 218.
- ³³ *Critical Heritage*, p. 179, taken from *The Spectator*, 66 (1891), p. 764.
- ³⁴ 'Our Library List: "New Grub Street"', *Murray's Magazine*, 9 (1891), 855-6 (p. 855).
- ³⁵ 'Some Younger Reputations', *The Academy*, 52 (1897), 488-97 (p. 489).
- ³⁶ George Gissing, *New Grub Street*, ed. by Bernard Bergonzi (London: Penguin, 1985) p. 173. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text marked, NGS.
- ³⁷ E. A. B., p. 724.
- ³⁸ E. A. B., p. 724.
- ³⁹ Raymond Williams, *The Long Revolution* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1965), p. 274.
- ⁴⁰ Terry Eagleton 'The Flight to the Real', in *Cultural Politics at the Fin de Siècle*, ed. by Sally Ledger and Scott MacCracken (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 9-21 (p. 14); Gissing, *Commonplace Book*, p. 41.
- ⁴¹ Williams, p. 275.
- ⁴² Graham Hough, *The Last Romantics* (London: Gerald Duckworth, 1949), p. 178; Gissing writes that he is reading *La Vie de Bohème* for the twentieth time in his *Diary*, 13 April 1890, p. 214.
- ⁴³ Renato Poggioli, *The Theory of the Avant-Garde*, trans. by Gerald Fitzgerald (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1968), p. 95 & 114.
- ⁴⁴ Sally Ledger describes the 1890s as a time when Britain was 'caught between two ages', Victorian and Modern, 'The New Woman and the Crisis of Victorianism', in *Cultural Politics* (22-44), p. 22.
- ⁴⁵ Jacob & Cynthia Korg, *Gissing on Fiction* (London: Enitharmon, 1978), p. 82.
- ⁴⁶ Andrew Lang, 'Realism in Grub Street', *The Author*, 2 (1891), 43-4 (43)

⁴⁷ John Gross, *The Rise and Fall of the English Man of Letters: Aspects of English Literary Life since 1800* (London: Penguin, 1991), p. 151.

⁴⁸ *Collected Letters*, IV, p. 26.

⁴⁹ David Grylls, *The Paradox of Gissing* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1986), p. 94. Halperin concurs when he suggests that Gissing saw a connection between 'the mob and bourgeois morality' in that both were anti-pathetic to art, p. 124.

⁵⁰ Gissing, *Charles Dickens*, p. 76.

⁵¹ Bernard Bergonzi's introduction to *NGS*, p. 14.

⁵² Margaret Diane Stetz, 'New Grub Street and the Woman Writer of the 1890s', in *Transforming Genres: New Approaches to British Fiction in the 1890s*, ed. by Nikki Lee Manos and Meri-Jane Rochelson (London: Macmillan, 1994), 21-45 (p. 22).

⁵³ Stetz, p. 42.

⁵⁴ P. J. Keating, *George Gissing: New Grub Street*, Studies in English Literature, 33 (London: Edward Arnold, 1968), p. 13.

⁵⁵ *Gissing, Selections*, p. 31. The relationship between Gissing's life and his fiction has been a subject of interest to his critics. John Halperin's biography, *Gissing, A Life in Books* is written on the premise that Gissing's fiction is at its most effective when it is at its most autobiographical. On such criteria *NGS* scores highly. Halperin describes it as 'a spiritual autobiography, a personal history', believing that the 'brilliance of *New Grub Street* derives largely from the novelist's unstinting use of his own experiences and feelings to tell the story', p. 141-2. His reliance on biographical detail for the literary interpretation of Gissing's work is described by Robert L. Selig, however, as no more than a 'reductive form of biographical decoding', in 'Biographical Decoding: Gissing's Life and Work', *Review*, 5 (1983), 203-10 (p. 203).

⁵⁶ *Gissing, Selections*, p. 9.

⁵⁷ *Gissing, Selections*, p. 17-18. Gissing, himself, was aware of the danger of using his own experiences in his fiction, realising how they might be misinterpreted by critics. In 1903 he wrote to Frederic Harrison about the forthcoming *Ryecroft Papers* hoping that 'too much will not be made of the few autobiographical papers in the book. The thing is much more an aspiration than a memory', Austin Harrison, 'George Gissing', *Nineteenth Century and After*, 60 (1906), 453-63 (p. 463). Reprinted in *The Collected Letters of George Gissing*, IV, p. 58.

⁵⁸ Keating, *George Gissing*, p. 13.

⁵⁹ Pierre Coustillas, ed., *London and the Life of Literature in Late Victorian England: The Diary of George Gissing, Novelist* (Sussex: Harvester Press, 1978), p. 1.

⁶⁰ McDonald, p. 14.

⁶¹ The fact that he has a newspaper delivered especially for him during his stay, indicates not only the way that transport has enabled the spread of journalism to provincial areas throughout the century, but Milvain's determination to take advantage of this in order to keep up-to-date with everything that is happening in London while he is away. Accordingly, John Goode argues that the newspaper is an 'instrument of urban mobility' reflecting the 'modern system of spatial conquest', in *George Gissing: Ideology and Fiction* (London: Vision Press, 1978), p. 114.

⁶² Milvain makes no attempt to reveal any symbolic value which may be invested in Reardon's work.

⁶³ John Sutherland, 'Victorian Novelists: A Survey', *Critical Quarterly*, 30 (1988), 50-61 (p. 59)

⁶⁴ Collie, p. 119.

⁶⁵ In her book Christina Sjöholm touches briefly upon the connection between

attitudes of love and art in the characters of Milvain and Reardon, see Ch. 3, *New Grub Street* in *'The Vice of Wedlock': The Theme of Marriage in George Gissing's Novels* (Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, 1994), pp. 52 - 64. The antithesis of Reardon's idealism in love and art is represented by Jasper Milvain, with his pragmatic, not to say cynical attitude to life', p. 59.

⁶⁶ Holbrook Jackson, *The Eighteen Nineties: A Review of Art and Ideas at the Close of the Nineteenth Century* (London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1976), p. 52. The *Yellow Book*, in itself, demonstrates the wish for money even from the most dedicated artists in the field of restricted production. It was a magazine built upon the 'art for art's sake' principles, yet at the same time it was as much a commercial venture as the cheap editions.

⁶⁷ McDonald, p. 14

⁶⁸ [Walter Low], 'The Complete Leader-Writer (by Himself)', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 70 (1894), 359-364 (p. 359). Further references to this article are given after quotations in the text.

⁶⁹ **Other criteria** include not having a sense of humour, not being independent or long-sighted, followed by tips for the uninitiated. If unsure then quotation is useful, sarcasm good, and Latin never goes wrong.

⁷⁰ Matthew Arnold, 'Up to Easter', in *The Complete Prose Works of Matthew Arnold, Vol. XI, The Last Word*, ed. by R. H. Super, 11 vols. (Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1960-77), XI (1977), p.202.

⁷¹ McDonald brings in Whelpdale's *Chit-Chat* as an attack on magazines like *Tit-Bits*, highlighting the parallels between the fictional and factual publications, p. 148.

⁷² W. T. Stead, 'The Future of Journalism', *The Contemporary Review*, 50 (1886), 653-74 (p.663/4).

⁷³ Stead, p. 664.

⁷⁴ Stokes, p. 22.

⁷⁵ W. T. Stead, 'Government by Journalism', *The Contemporary Review*, 49 (1886), 653-74 (p. 655).

⁷⁶ Stead, 'Government by Journalism', p. 670.

⁷⁷ McDonald, p. 15 & 16.

⁷⁸ The attitude which writers had towards this trend in the 1890s is reflected more concisely by Reardon when he refers to it as a 'confounded swindle', *NGS*, p.195.

⁷⁹ Besant, 'The Literary Agent', *The Nineteenth Century*, 38 (1895), 979-86 (p. 982).

⁸⁰ Harrison, p. 457, cited in Bergonzi's introduction to *NGS*, p. 11.

⁸¹ Korg, *George Gissing: A Critical Biography*, p. 46. Korg reveals that Gissing prepared his contributions for the Russian quarterly with his 'usual conscientiousness', which meant that each article required a month's preparation. While the work brought in thirty-two pounds a year it 'involved labor that Gissing soon found intolerable'. His method of work can thus be considered as the antithesis of New Journalism.

⁸² *Collected Letters of George Gissing*, IV, p. 140.

⁸³ Grylls, p. 93.

⁸⁴ *Collected Letters of George Gissing*, IV, p. 295.

⁸⁵ *Collected Letters of George Gissing*, IV, p. 8.

⁸⁶ Gissing, George, 'The Hope of Pessimism', in *George Gissing: Essays & Fiction*, ed. by Pierre Coustillas (London: John Hopkins Press, 1970), 75-97 (p. 95).

⁸⁷ In this way Milvain introduces the idea of social Darwinism into the realm of the literary field. It is no longer merely a struggle for existence among living creatures, but among everything. See Goode, p. 115, where he discusses Milvain's 'self-conscious rationality'.

⁸⁸ *Collected Letters of George Gissing*, IV, p. 214.

⁸⁹ Keating, *George Gissing*, p. 39.

⁹⁰ George Gissing, *Thyrza: A Tale*, ed. by Jacob Korg (Sussex: Harvester, 1974), p. 63.

⁹¹ Halperin, p. 75. He explains that they carefully marketed this book to appear at the height of social agitation. They only accepted the first two volumes on the understanding that the last one could be written at once, p. 74-5.

⁹² The other two books are *A Life's Morning* and *Thyrza*. Gissing wrote that 'it is good to have my books advertised all together at the end of vol. 1', *Collected Letters of George Gissing*, IV, p. 289.

⁹³ A. Conan Doyle, *The White Company* (London: Smith, Elder, 1891), title-page. The reasons for presenting Conan Doyle as author of 'Micah Clarke' differed from those given for Gissing, because Longman's had published the earlier work. Smith, Elder could have chosen from other titles, again none of which they published, and indeed on the facing page they list, *A Study in Scarlet*, *The Firm of Girdiestone*, *The Sign of Four* and *The Captain of the Polestar* as other titles by the same author. At this time Owen Dudley Edwards suggests that Conan Doyle had two growing reputations, one as the author of Sherlock Holmes and the other as a historical novelist, in *The Quest for Sherlock Holmes: A Biographical Study of Arthur Conan Doyle* (London: Macmillan, 1983), p. 12. It was obviously more commercial to link this new historical novel directly with his last one.

⁹⁴ Halperin, p. 139. Gissing's acceptance is written in a letter to Smith, Elder dated 7 January 1891, *Collected Letters of George Gissing*, IV, p. 253.

⁹⁵ Guinevere Griest, *Mudie's Circulating Library* (Devon: David and Charles, 1970), p. 4.

⁹⁶ Griest, p. 161.

⁹⁷ Griest, p. 6.

⁹⁸ Bernard Bergonzi's introduction to *NGS*, p. 24.

⁹⁹ Halperin, p. 3.

¹⁰⁰ *Collected Letters of George Gissing*, IV, p. 131.

¹⁰¹ Halperin, p. 148; A. O. J. Cockshut, *Anthony Trollope* (London: Methuen, 1955), p. 204.

¹⁰² Anthony Trollope, *The Way We Live Now* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1907), p. 14 & 15.

¹⁰³ For example see his remarks on Trollope, as noted by Gabrielle Fleury in *The Commonplace Book*, p. 67.

¹⁰⁴ Gissing, *Charles Dickens*, p. 40.

¹⁰⁵ *NGS*, p. 467; Charles Dickens, *Oliver Twist* (London: Penguin, 1986), p. 451.

¹⁰⁶ *Collected Letters of George Gissing*, IV, p. 243.

¹⁰⁷ Goode, pp. 116 & 119.

CHAPTER THREE

‘Collective Misrecognition’: Walter Besant and Henry James

There are two values of literary work - distinct, separate, not commensurable - they cannot be measured, they cannot be considered together. The one is the literary value of the work - its artistic, poetic, dramatic value [...] on that value is based the real position of every writer in his generation, and the estimate of him, should he survive for generations to follow. I do not greatly blame those who cry out upon the connection of literature with trade: they are jealous and rightly jealous, for the honour of letters.
Walter Besant¹

The division between the sub-fields of large-scale and restricted production is one of the oppositions around which Bourdieu's field of cultural production is structured. Peter McDonald describes them as 'in part two different communication circuits' that 'occupy rival positions in the cultural hierarchy'.² Such a division creates two economies working within the field of literary production because while the former sub-field trades in economic capital, the latter concerns itself with the accumulation of symbolic capital; those in the sub-field of restricted production 'acknowledge no other demand than one it can generate itself', while those in the field of large-scale production 'make the trade in cultural goods just another trade' (*Rules*, p. 142). Bourdieu explains that this dual economy can only exist through a system of misrecognition. To be able to sell a work of art at a price disproportionate to the cost of its production requires a tradition within

which 'the universe of celebrants and believers [. . .] give it meaning and value in terms of that tradition' (*Field*, p. 83):

So it can be seen that it is both true and false to say (with Marx, for example) that the market value of the work of art had no common measure with its cost of production: true, if one takes into account only the fabrication of the material object, the responsibility of the artist (or at least the painter) alone; false, if one means the production of the work of art as a sacred and consecrated object, product of an immense enterprise of *symbolic alchemy* involving the collaboration [. . .] of a whole set of agents engaged in the field of production.
(*Rules*, p. 170)

It is the symbolic value of a literary work that Besant is describing in the epigraph taken from his autobiography.

Symbolic profit is the 'economic or political profit disavowed, misrecognised and thereby recognised, hence legitimate, a "credit" which, under certain conditions, and always in the long run, guarantees "economic" profits' (*Field*, p. 75). Initially symbolic capital gives the participant a 'name' which is highly sought within a field that functions on a system of belief. The investment in prestige or achieving a 'name' occurs in the field of restricted production, a sub-field shown in the previous chapter to be apparently scornful of economic principles deeming as legitimate 'only those rewards, like peer recognition, which affect one's status within the field itself'.³ Paradoxically, it is those who pursue short-term financial rewards in the sub-field of large-scale production, however, who will be denied the opportunity to gain the highest profits available in the field of cultural production. This is because the alleged 'disinterestedness' in financial gain found in the sub-field of restricted production is not without its own rewards.⁴

Bourdieu explains the disadvantages which lie ahead for those who shamelessly chase popularity, and thus merely monetary rewards:

Producers and vendors of cultural goods who 'go commercial' condemn themselves, and not only from an ethical or aesthetic point of view, because they deprive themselves of the opportunities open to those who can *recognize* the specific demands of this universe and who, by concealing from themselves and others the interests at stake in their practice, obtain the means of deriving profits from disinterestedness.

(Field, p. 75)

Investment in 'disinterestedness' is not always recognised as an investment, nor is it always undertaken consciously. Moreover, if a participant can remain in the sub-field of restricted production long enough he will also eventually reap financial reward to supplement his reputation.

Paul DiMaggio suggests that Bourdieu's work seeks to form an 'economics of symbolic exchange and of the transformations of the different kinds of capital into one another'.⁵ The dichotomy between monetary and symbolic capital within the field of cultural production is, therefore, not complete. No-one intentionally enters the field to fail, yet economic failure in this anti-economy can produce valuable symbolic gain. Bourdieu maintains that the 'disavowal of the "economy" is placed at the very heart of the field' through the denunciation of 'the mercenary compromises or calculating manoeuvres of [adversaries]' (Field, p. 79). Therefore, it is a false dichotomy which Besant sets up between the different values of art.

In *Longman's Magazine* in December 1884 Robert Louis Stevenson described Walter Besant and Henry James as 'two men certainly of very different character'. He elaborated, professing James to be 'the very type of the deliberate artist' and Besant 'the impersonation of good nature'.⁶ So why should the two authors be considered together, both in this chapter and in Stevenson's article? First, in this chapter it is useful to consider Besant and James as two figures from the 1890s who are normally allocated positions at opposite poles within Besant's false dichotomy. Besant is a symbol of the growing professionalisation of authorship and consequently its commercialisation in the 1890s, denounced for his 'mercenary compromises' and in opposition is the writer to whom 'disinterestedness' became

an art form in itself, Henry James. A closer look at the actions and writings of these two men in the 1890s should reveal the contradictions in such extreme representations, concluding, as Bourdieu does, that neither total and cynical subordination to demand or absolute independence from the market and its exigencies is ever attained; the dichotomy is not complete.

Second, Stevenson's comparison of the two writers in 'A Humble Remonstrance' arose from circumstance. He was writing ostensibly in reply to the exchange of opinions concerning 'The Art of Fiction' which had passed between Besant and James earlier in the year. This interactive debate is a useful place with which to begin positioning the central characters, each contribution being a manifestation of its author's position, as defined by the objective structures of the field.

'The Art of Fiction' Debate

The 'Art of Fiction' debate between Besant, James and finally Stevenson in 1884 left a legacy which influenced those in the field of literary production in the following years. Biffen and Reardon's conversation in *New Grub Street* is evidence of this legacy, for example, upon Gissing:

'Whatever a man writes for effect is wrong and bad.'
'Only in your view. There may surely exist such a thing as the art of fiction.'

(NGS, p. 175-6)

In general terms, the fictional writers are discussing two opposing conceptions of art held at the end of the century. The *for effect* is associated with the sensationalist aspects attributed to the decadent movement which created a new position in the field of restricted production in the 1890s. Under the leadership of Oscar Wilde, they propounded a more elitist form of art. Naturally, their presence brought them

into conflict with those already in the field, fuelling a great debate in the first five years of the decade. On the opposing side were those who argued, like the authors of the manuals, that there was an art of fiction, or what Biffen proceeds to class as 'novelistic conventionalities' (NGS, p. 176). Specifically, however, Gissing's choice of words would have immediately brought the 'Art of Fiction' debate into the mind of a contemporary reader.

It would be misleading to present Besant and James as the first and last words of this literary discussion, they are but two contenders. Mark Spilka asserts that it began with the article on 'Henry James, Jr.' by William Dean Howells in *Century Magazine* and Stevenson's 'A Gossip on Romance' in *Longman's Magazine* which both appeared in 1882.⁷

Howell's article reflected that the art of fiction had 'become a finer art' in his day than it had been in the days of Dickens and Thackeray, and one of the main points of contention, on James's part at least, was that the critical discourse in Britain had not developed in a similar manner.⁸ He wrote to Stevenson in 1888 that 'criticism is of an object density and puerility - it doesn't exist', complaining further that critics like Andrew Lang write 'everything down to the lowest level of Philistine twaddle'.⁹ Vivien Jones suggests that James wished to challenge the 'whole school of defensively insular critics', and in the appearance of Besant's 'Art of Fiction' article James recognised a unique opportunity.¹⁰

James published his rejoinder to Besant's 'Art of Fiction' in *Longman's Magazine* in September 1884 under the same title. In his summary of the articles, Nigel Cross argues that in James's there was 'subtlety, psychology, imagination; there was Art where Besant had preached Craft', whereas Besant's was 'less about the art of fiction and rather more of a blueprint for popular novel writing'.¹¹ While James recognised the limitations of Besant's aesthetic arguments, as will be discussed later, he welcomed the opportunity for debate which the article provided. For example, he reflects that only 'a short time ago it might have been supposed

that the English novel [. . .] had no air of having a theory, a conviction, a consciousness of itself behind it'.¹² Further, he accepts the necessity of such discussion:

Art lives upon discussion, upon experiment, upon curiosity, upon variety of attempt [. . .]. The successful application of any art is a delightful spectacle, but the theory too is interesting; and though there is a great deal of the latter without the former I suspect there has never been a genuine success that has not had a latent core of conviction.

(p. 187)

A novel is no longer a novel 'as a pudding is a pudding' merely to be swallowed, but something to be discussed and Besant had, to a certain extent, opened the 'era of discussion' (p. 187). James's 'Art of Fiction' was written not to antagonise Besant, but to continue what he felt was, and proved to be, the beginning of a valuable critical debate.

In a field which is structured not only in linear terms, but hierarchically in terms of relative legitimacy, critical discourse is important. The discourse surrounding a work is not only 'designed to encourage its appreciation, but a moment which is part of the production of the work, its meaning and its value'. That is the critic, himself inscribed in the field, injects 'meaning and value' into a work through his critical discourse, constantly transforming the position of the author within the field, and changing the conditions within the field itself. Thus, the debate between Besant and James, and latterly James and Stevenson, necessarily influenced the whole field and, to a greater or lesser degree the status of every writer within it. Unquestionably, it had its part to play in the discussion of realism considered in the re-positioning of Gissing.

Besant proposes in the opening pages of his pamphlet that fiction writing, as an art, is in every way 'the equal of the Arts of Painting, Sculpture, Music, and Poetry' (p. 6).¹³ In his reply James agrees, suggesting that it 'is impossible to insist too much upon so important a truth', but he is simultaneously aware of the fact that

'in addition to the people to whom it has never occurred that a novel ought to be artistic, there are a great many others who, if this principle were urged upon them, would be filled with an indefinable mistrust' (p. 189). James wishes to challenge the way that critics look at fiction-writing, to move away from plot and character onto questions of form, realising that the field of fiction 'must take itself seriously for the public to take it so' (p. 187); and he is grateful for Walter Besant as 'the impersonation of good nature' for introducing the idea. His gratitude serves as an indication of their disparate status within the field at that moment.

According to Fred W. Boege 'The Art of Fiction' appeared during the period when Besant wrote his four best novels (1882-1884), one of which *All Sorts and Conditions of Men* sold 250, 000 copies in England and America. Therefore, as Spilka highlights, here was 'a popular speaker' asking the public to take fiction seriously as art, thus setting up an audience for James that he badly needed, but one which he could not attract himself at that time.¹⁴ Spilka continues by arguing that 'the "desire to consider Fiction as one of the Fine Arts" was not then a national sentiment. Yet it became one the moment Besant spoke, for Besant himself was a register for the national mind'.¹⁵ Through his unquestionable consecration within the field of large-scale production as a popular novelist, Besant could introduce this audience to new ideas, in a way in which James could not.

'The Art of Fiction' debate prompted a friendship and respect between James and Stevenson which is not mirrored between James and Besant. However, Stevenson was equally close to his audience as Besant, so if it was not popularity *per se* to which James was averse, what was the difference?¹⁶

The fact was that despite all his protestations about the elevation of fiction writing, Besant's essay reveals him to be one of the critics whom James was in fact attacking. Jones states that the literary criticism in England in the 1870s and 1880s was based on 'reader expectation' rather than the author or the text, in other words

on external demands legitimised only in the field of large-scale production. For example, in his defence of the conscious moral purpose in the modern English novel Besant writes that, 'so much are we accustomed to expect it, that one feels as if there has been a debasement of the Art' if it does not appear (p. 57). Moreover, when considering the ambiguous topic of 'truth' within a novel, to be taken up by both James and Stevenson, he writes:

The people who read novels and know nothing about the art of writing them, recognise before any other quality that of fidelity: the greatness of the novelist they measure chiefly by the knowledge of the world displayed in his pages; the highest praise they can bestow on him is that he has drawn the story to the life[. . .]. Most of the other qualities [. . .] of the novel [. . .] all that has to do with technique, escape the general observer.

(p. 37-8)

Besant's 'general observer' is the same as the 'Average Reader' whose expectations Jones proposes governed English literary criticism at the time, and by bearing him in mind Besant's 'art of fiction' is necessarily at odds with that of James's.¹⁷ James is less concerned with the 'critics and the readers', than with the producer's point of view (p. 197) and thus in his article, while accepting his debt to Besant for opening the argument up, he implies that it should now be continued by others. He thinks that 'other labourers in the field will doubtless take up the argument' and is pleased that Stevenson accepts the challenge. James describes him as 'someone who *does* write - who is really acquainted with that lovely art' (*HJL*, p. 57).

Stevenson's essay does disagree with James's on issues of art, indeed George Dekker suggest that they were further apart in their methods and aims in this exchange, than at any other point in their careers.¹⁸ James argues that art imitates life, while Stevenson prefers to separate life and imaginative art; nevertheless, it is the manner in which Stevenson argues his case which commands James's respect. James had castigated Besant's 'abstract' ideas as merely suggestive, 'not exact' (p. 189 & 193). He contended that the 'value of these different injunctions - so

beautiful and so vague - is wholly in the meaning one attaches to them' and goes on to investigate the illusive meaning of 'reality' (p. 193). Stevenson was to deconstruct the language used in the preceding essays in a similar manner, suggesting that 'The Art of Fiction' should read 'the art of fictitious narrative in prose'.¹⁹ Such was the persuasiveness of Stevenson's argument that when James republished 'The Art of Fiction' in *Partial Portraits* four years later he revised art's 'attempt to compete with life', to an 'attempt to represent life'.²⁰ Their opinions of art may have differed, but their attitudes towards its discussion shared a new depth of interpretation, lacking in Besant.

On one level, Besant's argument does provide the 'blueprint for popular novel writing' that Cross suggests and of which James disapproves. He effectively lists the requirements of a successful novelist: he must write from his own experiences; keep a common-place book; characterise clearly without resorting to dialogue or long description; have a conscious moral purpose; concentrate on style; and remember that the story is of paramount importance. James does present a conflicting opinion, although Jones contends that he plays a 'precarious game with Besant, keeping endorsement and censure almost indistinguishable'.²¹ His one explicit criticism of Besant's article is precisely that it should attempt to 'say so definitely beforehand what sort of affair the good novel will be', challenging the received ideas of the novel and contending that 'certain traditions on the subject, applied *a priori*, have already had much to answer for' (p. 191). James propounds that to produce the 'illusion of life' is the 'beginning and end of the art of the novelist' (p. 195) and that the only obligation a novel has, and which is not restrictive, is that it should be interesting. Again James states that, to function at all, the art of fiction must be free, later explaining to Stevenson that his 'pages in *Longman's*, were simply a plea for liberty'.²²

Superficially, Besant and James's articles do reveal positions consistent with attitudes in the field of large-scale and restricted production, respectively. One

describes how to write a successful novel, in financial terms, while the other promotes the freedom of the artist from external demands. James would appear to represent the ideology of the producers-for-producers promoting creative liberty, allowing works to create their public, in opposition to Besant and the laws of the market, which prefer the public to create the work (*Field*, p. 127). The aims of each of the authors, hinted at when Stevenson recalls Besant's 'interesting lecture', as opposed to James's 'charming essay', however, should be taken into account when considering the opinions they present.²³

Besant's article was initially given as a lecture to the Royal Institution, only to be published later in the pamphlet form in which James encountered it. Its concentration on the scientific aspects of literature, therefore, must be understood in the context of this address. As N. N. Feltes explains Besant was, after all, 'speaking before an organization which had been founded in 1799 to "teach the application of science to the useful purposes of life"'.²⁴ Besant had even taken the care to guard against the type of criticism, which was nonetheless levelled against his article, when he explained:

For every Art there is a corresponding science. We have been speaking of the corresponding science. But the Art itself can neither be taught nor communicated. If the thing is in the man, he will bring it out somehow - well or badly, quickly or slowly. If it is not, he can never learn it.

(p. 68)

Outwardly, James's article was written in reply to Besant's and following his lead James could now develop the argument along the lines he preferred, replacing Besant's theory of art with his own. As Michael Anesko suggests, James uses his article to 'prepare the reading public for the new kind of fiction that [he] was about to attempt'.²⁵

An artist defines his art in order to maintain the pretence that he has some control over the reception of that art, reluctant to give up sole control of its

production. This early attempt on James's part to determine the reception of his work is echoed throughout his career. At the age of 62, he wrote to Scribner's publishing house to arrange for the publication of a definitive edition of some of his works, each volume of which was to include a preface written by James. As Sarah Daugherty highlights, these prefaces do not constitute an aesthetic by which other writers should be judged but are merely 'his presentation of his own case'.²⁶ With these prefaces, Anesko judges that 'James had one of the rarest opportunities ever afforded to an artist: the chance to supply the kind of intelligent criticism his work deserved, but which it had failed to elicit from contemporary readers or men of letters'.²⁷

Therefore, Besant's aims were determined by different forces than James's showing that, paradoxically, while Besant was addressing a specific and initially restricted audience, it was James who was promoting his type of art to the mass audience. Further, the 'formula for success' is only one of three propositions addressed by Besant.²⁸ It would be misleading, therefore, to focus on this aspect alone. Taking the three points in turn, the first contends that fiction is equal to the arts of sculpture, music, painting and poetry. Second, the art of fiction is governed by general laws which can be 'laid down and taught with as much precision and exactness as the laws of harmony, perspective and proportion' (p. 6). Yet, importantly, in his third point he is quite clear that 'like the other Fine Arts, Fiction is so far removed from the mere mechanical arts, that no laws or rules whatever can teach it to those who have not already been endowed with the natural and necessary gifts' (p. 6). His main concern, ironically, is to elevate the position of the novelist, not to vulgarise it. Jones notes this conflict within Besant's essay:

[it] is at first sight an attack on the commercial Philistinism which denied fiction the status of a fine art. It suggests a plea for the seriousness of form similar to James's own. The terms in which Besant defends his claim, however, identify him with the forces he is ostensibly attacking.²⁹

Besant thought that novelists held an unwarranted lowly position in the world of art, indicated by the lack of honours bestowed on them. The art of novel-writing was undervalued and held in 'affectionate contempt' (p. 12) by the public and the reason was twofold: the belief, perpetuated by writers, that the art of fiction was learnt by intuition; and the fact that there was no academy or association for novelists. This lack of institutionalism allowed the man on the street to conceive that the ability to write successful fiction could be acquired unconsciously or through imitation. Besant considered the prevailing view among the majority of those who wished to enter the field of fiction to be that anyone 'can write a novel; therefore, why not sit down and write one?' (p. 15). Bourdieu sees this aspect of the field more positively. It is the very permeability of the field's frontiers which allows it to attract agents who 'differ greatly in their properties and dispositions', to the 'extreme diversity' of positions on offer therein (*Field*, p. 43).

Besant was aware of the growth in the literary field and what he perceived as a corresponding fall in standards. The solution he proposed was that if those newly entering the field approached it with more seriousness and understanding 'the low-level of Art with which both novel-writer and novel-reader are too often contented' would perish (p. 64). It is the promotion of such earnestness and understanding with which his article is concerned. He believed that there were general rules and principles behind fiction, 'considering, however, the vast quantity of bad, inartistic work' which was placed before the public every week, he was inclined to think that, 'a statement of these principles may not be without usefulness' (p. 34). James agreed that 'the field at large suffers discredit from overcrowding' (p. 191), but he could not acquiesce with Besant's solution.

James believed that the teaching of Besant's 'general principles' would not remedy the situation, but would, if anything, make it worse, but he also acknowledged the important part which Besant had played in promoting a change in previously unchallenged critical thought. In retrospect the 'The Art of Fiction'

discussion has been described as one through which 'the novel in England and America acquired its first modern credo'.³⁰ Leon Edel summarises the three main contributions:

Thus had been stated in public, during this year, three distinct views of the novel: Besant's had been that of the efficient and good-natured hack, the "maker" of fiction; James had argued for the novel as a work of art which re-creates reality; and Stevenson from his own formula spoke for make-believe.³¹

Even in this condensed form, the critical alliance between Stevenson and James is apparent, in contrast to Besant's workmanlike approach.

Besant's presentation of the steps towards successful and, moreover, popular fiction writing placed him within the field of large-scale production, and his call for greater institutionalisation of the field aligned him with those demanding copyright for authors. Leslie Stephen's article 'Authors for Hire', in *The Cornhill Magazine* (1881), highlights the tradition against which Besant was fighting. Stephen is considering the question of authorial copyright which was currently concerning British and American writers. He deems that the question of pay belongs to the lower sphere, indeed, 'those who wish for restrictions upon the sale of books must not give themselves the airs of men really attempting to reward merit. The commercial question is altogether collateral and subordinate. The great writer, in one sense, deserves no pay at all; for he is only discharging the duty imposed upon him by his genius'.³²

The dual economy working within the field is problematic and Stephen appears hypocritical when he goes on to assert:

Anyone would rejoice in any pecuniary advantages which might come to Wordsworth in his old age, though the prospect of gaining them was not his motive for exertion. If a few of our great writers are now reaping a larger harvest [...] we do not grudge a penny of it [...]. If our great men have worked for love instead of hire, it would be mean of us to make their unselfishness a pretext for cheating them of their pay.

In other words, it is fair for a writer to receive money for his art, only if he has previously proved himself, in Bourdieu's terms, to be 'disinterested' in financial profit.

The latter-day fortunes of these two authors demonstrate the economies at work in the two sub-fields. James represents the aloof artist scorning popularity, while Besant is a symbol of the professionalisation of the literary world, and it is the 'disinterestedness' of the former which has reaped its reward. While Besant was a popular novelist, gaining further recognition and honour through his work for the Society of Authors, James's work never brought him large monetary success while he lived. Now, at the end of the twentieth century, where Jamesian criticism fills the shelves of libraries, Besant is resigned to chapters and footnotes in books dedicated to other subjects. Similarly, while there are over 180 editions of James's work, including letters, diaries and cassettes, currently available in Britain, only two editions of Besant are still in print; *All Sorts and Conditions of Men* and *Amorel of Lyonesse*.³³ A manifestation of their respective positions today is Robert Colby's assertion that Besant's 'Art of Fiction' is primarily remembered 'because it provoked a rejoinder by Henry James'.³⁴ It would seem that Besant enjoyed the immediate but short-lived success found in the field of large-scale production in the 1890s, while James has prospered from the long term reward offered by the field of restricted production. What separates them is the '*interval of time* that is imposed between labour and reward'.³⁵

The posthumous success and reputation enjoyed by James in the 1990s is both in spite, and because, of his very public 'disavowal' of the economy. In contrast, Besant claimed that 'there has never been any poet or author who has in reality been unwilling to take all the money his works would bring in'.³⁶ This not only reiterates that characters like Biffen can only afford to exist in fiction but highlights the fallacy within any disavowal of the economy. The following

investigations into Walter Besant and Henry James concentrate on their relationships within this fallacy from their opposite poles in the field.

The Making of Walter Besant

In *The Pen and the Book* (1899) Besant lists the various literary positions he had held during his fifty years in the field of cultural production: leader-writer, reviewer, writer of literary studies, historian, biographer, novelist, dramatist, reader for a publisher, editor and chairman of the Society of Authors. Each position is linked by writing, and Besant preferred to stress the similarities of each rather than concentrate on the differences. He suggests that 'as authors, editors, and journalists do often overlap and run into one another's field of work, we will not try and distinguish them' (*Pen*, p. 1), an attitude which ignored any hierarchical structuring of cultural products. For him the word 'literature' signified the 'whole current printed word - good and bad - the whole production of the day' (*Pen*, p. 3), an aspect of his character which S. Squire Sprigge emphasised in his preface to Besant's autobiography. Sprigge defined his dislike 'of all attempts at placing novelists above or below one another in some arbitrary hierarchy' as 'part of his high conceptions of a novelist's duties' (*Auto*, p. xvii). This all embracing attitude of Besant's was not judged so favourably by all critics.

Another contemporary judgement of Besant is given in his obituary in *The Academy*. He died, aged 65, on the 9 June 1901 and shared his obituary with another writer, Robert Buchanan. It suggests that Buchanan's relative failure concealed his greater ability as a 'literary artist', while Besant's success was achieved through a 'well-balanced, rather professional, correctness' concealing a somewhat 'ordinary mind'.³⁷ The conclusion summarises the values perceived in each man:

While recognising the rightness of Sir Walter Besant's efforts to improve the author's relations to publishers, and accepting the value-for-money principle which he held so dear, we think that his view of literature was too professional; and that in his very eagerness to secure the dignity of letters he was [...] defeating his own aims. Neither by his writing nor in his practical literary life did Sir Walter Besant add to the romance of letters; but he was in harmony with his age in bringing commercial common sense to bear on the literary life, and in seeking to widen the portals which lead to it. All his work was sound, and nearly all had a high market value [...]. His death leaves a gap in the organised literary life of London which will not soon be filled, or filled so worthily. No such gap is created by the death of Robert Buchanan; in the world of ideas, and in the literature of the sincere but vexed spirits, his vacant place is very noticeable.³⁸

Besant is 'too professional' with 'high market value' and the idealism implied by Sprigge is left unmarked. Besant is given the monetary rewards and the title, but Buchanan receives the symbolic acclaim, revealing succinctly the rival principles of valuation at the heart of the field's structure. Preferring to recognise the demands of the economy is perhaps one of the reasons why the obituary's prophecy was incorrect. Besant was only to enjoy the immediate benefits available in the field of large-scale production so that by 1956, Fred W. Boege could assess that when he died 'the man who had been at the very centre of the literary scene for twenty years disappeared leaving hardly a trace behind him'.³⁹

The field, as Peter McDonald explains, positions agents 'not only horizontally, in terms of their *function* in the circuit, but vertically, in terms of their *status* in the intricately structured field'.⁴⁰ While, as his lecture on the art of fiction demonstrated, Besant was concerned with elevating the status of writers in society as a whole, he was not interested, or failed to recognise the consequences of the hierarchical conflicts within the literary field itself. Accordingly, for Besant, the division between monetary reward and symbolic profit was simple and complete. He professed that while in production the only value of the work should be the literary value, 'otherwise it would be nought', but once finished it necessarily, and correctly, began to be judged on commercial standards; 'Here the artist ceases and

the man of business begins' (*Auto*, p. 228). The failure to recognise the value in disavowing the economy contributed to Besant's diminishing status within the field, and his failure to do so is revealed through his writing as well as his actions.

Boege suggests that after a period of high repute in the 1880s, Besant's literary reputation suffered a sharp decline in the last 15 years of his life.⁴¹ This was not only the result of the 'steady flow of almost unrelieved mediocrity' which Boege judges Besant to have produced between 1887 and 1901, but by his increasing involvement in the 'too professional' aspects of literary production which saw his name become linked inextricably with commercialism. Victor Bonham-Carter argues that the name Besant means little nowadays; 'successful as he was in his day as journalist and author, he is not so remembered now'.⁴² If he is remembered for anything today it is as founder, chairman and driving force behind the Society of Authors and thus as a symbol of the professionalisation of the literary field throughout the 1890s. His once undisputed position as a primary producer of art has practically disappeared.

Besant's fiction-writing, which began when he encountered James Rice, resulted in him becoming one of the most popular novelists in England at that time.⁴³ In 1868 Rice had published an article of Besant's in his periodical *Once A Week*, which was not only full of editorial errors, but had been published without Besant's permission. An initial confrontation between the writer and the editor resulted in a lasting friendship and a successful professional partnership. The same year Besant tried his hand at a Christmas story for *Once a Week* explaining later that 'in place of a writer of "studies," "appreciations," and the lighter kind of criticism, I became a novelist' (*Auto*, p. 182). At the outset his fiction-writing was in collaboration with Rice. Their partnership lasted for ten years until Rice's illness in 1881, followed by his death in 1882. It produced what Besant calls 'three highly successful' novels, *Ready Money Mortiboy* (1872), *The Golden Butterfly* (1876) and *The Chaplain and the Fleet* (1879) with all the others doing 'very well' (*Auto*,

p. 197). Receiving £200 as a share of the profits on their first joint novel, *Ready Money Mortiboy*, Besant had justification in asserting that 'no other literary collaboration, [had] been comparable, in this country, with ours for success' (*Auto*, p. 187). Although Besant refused in his autobiography to divulge the division of labour, the writer of Besant's *DNB* entry claims that Rice was in charge of a novel's plot and its development, while Besant saw to its literary form.⁴⁴ After Rice's death, Besant continued to produce a novel a year until his own death in 1901.

Michael Anesko's definition of Besant as 'one of the great Victorian novel-machines' and Leon Edel's description of him as 'a busy Victorian' highlight two characteristics of his writing. First, they allude to the fact that all his books had a conscious moral purpose and could have graced the table of any Victorian household without causing offence, and second, to Besant's rapid rate of production. Both these aspects help to situate Besant in opposition to the developing image of the autonomous author. Practising what he preached in 'The Art of Fiction' all of Besant's novels contained a moral purpose, encompassing his desire 'above all things' that his villain 'should reap the fruit of his iniquities' (*Auto*, p. 199). Thus Phillis is found at the end of *The Golden Butterfly* promoting family values, more than happy with her husband and son, while the 'selfish and heartless' Mrs. Cassilis is punished, although the act of revenge by Tomlinson's which precipitated her downfall is explicitly condemned. The narrator concludes, 'so much for revenge; and I do hope that Tomlinson's example will be laid to heart, and pondered by other ladies'-maids whose mistresses are selfish and sharp-tempered'.⁴⁵ This conscious, and frequently intrusive, morality, however, was not linked with the prevalent belief that literature was dangerous.⁴⁶ Besant clearly demonstrates, through his own initial reading of *Tristram Shandy*, that a 'boy who is ignorant of things may read the worst books in the world without harm' (*Auto*, p. 52).

Concerning his rate of production, Besant was aware that by the end of the nineteenth century 'if a story-teller gives to the world a novel every year, the criticaster yaps at his heels and asks all the world to observe the haste which the novelist makes to get rich' (*Auto*, p. 200). Besant was a prolific writer, completing eighteen novels in eighteen years, a consequence of the conscious struggle early in his career to make 'the pen a servant instead of a master' (*Auto*, p. 199 & 144). He did not force himself to write, yet neither did he wait for inspiration. For him, inspiration was just 'another name for prolonged idleness under a nonsensical pretence' (*Auto*, p. 204). He reveals that his method is to write two or three chapters at speed, then returns later to re-write, correct and expand. Thus for him the 'novel is constructed much on the principle of a tunnel, in which the rough boring and blasting goes on ahead, while the completion of the work slowly follows' (*Auto*, p. 202-3).

It is Besant's utter lack of pretence in the description of his literary work, both in practical and commercial terms, in his autobiography which allows Boege to make comparisons with Trollope's autobiography. A remark of Gissing's concerning the latter publication indicates the system of misrecognition operating in the autonomous sub-field of the field of literary production. Considering 'Trollope's foolish Autobiog.', Gissing suggests that his reputation has been damaged by its 'revelation of mechanism'. He concludes that 'of course all artistic work is done, to a great extent mechanically, Trollope merely talked about it in a wrong & vulgar tone'.⁴⁷ Gissing was aware, as Trollope and Besant were, of the commercial and practical aspects of literary life, yet unlike them he perceived that long-term investment in a public disavowal of the economy would attract higher rewards.

Besant justified the synopsis of his method work by claiming that 'it may [. . .] be of some use to young aspirants to know how a craftsman in their art worked - may I add? - *non sine gloriâ*, not without a certain measure of success' (*Auto*, p.

203). He was proud of his popular success and keen to pass on advice to newcomers to the literary field in an effort to prevent a flood of mediocre works entering the field. In his eyes there was no shame in receiving monetary reward for literary work, indeed he seemed to be promoting the dignity of mass publication, unable to recognise the value placed on disinterestedness in the field of cultural production.

'The Art of Fiction' shows that at the heart of everything Besant did was the desire for the elevation, not the vulgarisation of the fiction writer. At no time did he aim to undermine art or the artist by linking its monetary value to its artistic value. He knew that there were different values which could be attributed to works of art which were not commensurate. He writes:

when people speak very foolishly about the shameful neglect of one author, while another, far inferior, is run after, remember that the literary worth of the neglected author may be fully acknowledged by all those whose judgement is worth having, but that the other man, for some reason or other, is the greater favourite, for the time, with the people.

(*Pen*, p. 4)

The important point is that Besant found it easy to separate symbolic and economic forms of capital in simple terms, warning the readers of *The Pen and The Book* to 'keep quite separate and distinct in [their] minds the literary value of the work and the commercial value of a work. There need not be any connection at all between the two' (*Pen*, p. 3). Besant did not realise that there must be connections; the dichotomy between the values was not complete. He failed to see that as a result of the 'economy reversed' in the field, the author who shamelessly pursued money necessarily precluded himself from the greater rewards of symbolic power. He witnessed the 'disinterestedness' of other writers as merely 'ignorance parading as the superiority of genius' (*Auto*, p. xxv).

A justification for Besant's favourable relationship with the system of valuation in the sub-field of large-scale production was that he did not have

contempt for the mass readership. Richard Salmon attributes to Besant a 'paternalistic liberal faith in "popular" education'.⁴⁸ Besant's desire to foster an appreciation of art among the masses embodied a faith in the consumer which was necessarily absent from the field of restricted production. He was angered by critics who spoke of the extremely successful penny papers with contempt. He felt that they did not understand that they expressed 'a certain stage in the growth of the mind, a stage out of which the stronger and keener mind will presently emerge' (*Pen*, p. 56).⁴⁹ The spread of education, in turn, should improve the quality of literature. In 'Literature as a Career' he considers the 'hapless wretches' without aptitude or learning who enter the field and form a 'class which lives by manufacturing books not wanted':⁵⁰

You may see the few who remain in it at the British Museum reading-room. With the spread of education their occupation will vanish. The time has come when all the world can write at least as well as these poor denizens of Grub Street. The time has come when only those who have a thing to say will secure a hearing.

(*Essays*, p. 331)

Besant is describing the normal economics of competition where it is generally accepted that the more competitors in a field, the better the product for the consumer. This does not apply to the field of literary production as shown by the twentieth century which has not produced a rise in 'great' writers commensurate with its growth in education.

Besant believed that once in publication, while some deserving works may be overlooked, no bad ones survived. He proposed that the term 'flooding the market' was a mere 'conventional phrase. Thousands of bad books may be produced, but they never get circulated; nobody buys them; they drop still-born from the press; they swell statistics alone' (*Auto*, p. 237). Neither could he remember of a 'single instance, in literary history, of the survival of a bad writer' (*Pen*, p. 35). Such faith

in the mass audience, allowed Besant to make concessions to it and each work was prepared with an certain audience in mind.

It is through such publications as his autobiography that Besant's perception of the economy within the field can be established. S. Squire Sprigge edited the unfinished *Autobiography of Sir Walter Besant* (1902), which Besant had been working on throughout the previous decade and this along with his works of fiction was directed towards the genial public he envisaged. He had already written 'Literature as a Career' for the *New York Forum* (1892) and *The Pen and the Book* (1899), containing the facts he deemed necessary for the production and sale of books, both works aimed at literary aspirants. Within these publications are hidden some of Besant's ideas on art and its commerciality.

In 'Literature as a Career' Besant addresses young writers and returns to his old concerns about the lack of honours, exams and a central protective body for those working in the literary profession. He then aligns himself with the field of large-scale production in his positive attitude towards the growth in journalism. For Besant the opening of this 'great field' is a blessing to all those working in the field of literary production. He insists that those who 'live by writing have of late years received an immense enlargement of independence by the development of journalism' and that the number of writers who can live by production of their original work without journalism is 'comparatively small' (*Essays*, p. 324 & 327). His opinion has not changed by the end of the decade. In *The Pen and the Book* he reiterates that it is 'impossible to over-estimate the assistance which journalism has rendered to the profession of letters' (*Pen*, p. 23). The Grub Street of old, he argues, had been replaced by the new opportunities in the field created by journalism, listing book reviews, articles and papers for the *DNB* as examples of these new openings. Whereas some writers saw the growth of the field as a threat to the status of the author, Besant regarded them, in many ways, as the field's

salvation. Unlike Leslie Stephen, he refused to perpetuate the myth that an author could survive on reputation alone.

Much of what is written in 'Literature as a Career' is taken from 'The Art of Fiction', and Besant returned again to his lecture for the Royal Institution in *The Pen and the Book*. This book is a guide to 'literary aspirants', divided into two sections. The first covers the pre-requisites to success in various literary modes in a manner reminiscent of the other literary manuals appearing in the 1890s, and it is here that 'The Art of Fiction' is republished as the chapter on novel-writing. Anyone entering the literary field, for example, must be well-read and, in this respect, Besant creates his own canon. A writer should have read, amongst others, Shakespeare, Pope, Keats, Byron, Dickens, Thackeray and Tennyson. Regarding contemporary work, a young writer should read it merely to 'catch the manner of his own generation' (*Pen*, p. 42).

The second half of *The Pen and the Book* is devoted to the commercial side of literature. Besant argues:

It is sometimes pretended that it is degrading to consider money in connection with literary work [. . .]. Who are the people who talk this nonsense? They are chiefly the unsuccessful writers. Not necessarily bad writers, but writers not popular.

(*Pen*, p. 133)

The attitude towards money taken by those in the field of restricted production, a sub-field where discredit increases with popularity, is no more than a maintaining of self-respect in Besant's eyes. He does not consider the symbolic investment present in their disinterestedness; writers, in his opinion, pretend to be above money only because they do not receive any. It is fortunate that Besant did not possess a disdain of money because for the last years of the nineteenth century he was to be inextricably linked with the commercial aspects of the field.

Besant's contribution to the defining rôle which the Society of Authors played in the 1890s was great. He wrote that in his capacity as Chairman of the Society

and editor of its magazine, *The Author*, he had had his 'attention necessarily turned to the commercial side of literature' (*Pen*, p. vi). As the literary market-place expanded, Besant did not run to the field of restricted production and condemn or disavow it, rather he remained to champion the cause of authors in a rapidly evolving field.

A chapter in his autobiography conveys Besant's view of the Society of Authors. S. Squire Sprigge explains that Besant had written in the manuscript of his wish to write a chapter on the Society but had not managed to do so before his death. Therefore, Sprigge took the editorial decision to publish, within the autobiography, the speech Besant had made on the occasion of his resignation as Chairman in 1892. It relates that the seeds of the society were sown in 1883, when the intentions and principles behind the society were 'not only imperfectly understood, they were not understood at all'; there was only the idea that it was to be an association for those involved in the field of letters (*Auto*, p. 216). The democratic view which Besant held of the field of literary production is again shown by the election of vice-presidents in all spheres of writing including history, science and theology as well as poetry, fiction and journalism.

The system of vice-presidents was later abandoned and the society incorporated into a company. The Society started in 1884 with 68 paying members and by 1892 it had 870, which was still only a small percentage of the people struggling to make their way in the field at that time. The reason behind this was that by the 1890s the concerns of the Society were predominantly commercial. It now had three main principles from which it never wavered:

- 1) The maintenance, definition, and defence of literary property.
- 2) The consolidation and amendment of the laws of Domestic Copyright.
- 3) The promotion of International Copyright.⁵¹

The Society, therefore, became responsible for highlighting fraudulent practices among publishers. It wanted to make authors less naïve by alerting its members to the monetary value of their work and Society publications helped to disperse relevant information.⁵² *Methods of Production* (1890), for example, emphasised the Society's 'demand for Literary property the same jealousy and the same resolution to obtain just treatment as prevails in all other branches of business'.⁵³ Besant believed that the Society merely 'enabled authors, in a word, to meet men of business as men of business' (*Auto*, p. 236), but Robert A. Colby concludes that many writers refused to join because they felt this approach commercialised art.⁵⁴ Gissing personifies this attitude when he laments the 'extent to which novelists are becoming *mere* men of business'.⁵⁵ Besant recognised the general antipathy, and related the 'stream of abuse, detraction, and wilful misrepresentation' of the Society's work to the age-long 'feeling that it is unworthy the dignity of letters to take any account at all of the commercial or pecuniary' aspects (*Auto*, p. 226-7).

The negative reaction to the Society by many authors is symptomatic of the dual economy in play within the field of literary production. Besant was subconsciously aware of the disadvantages which a system of misrecognition imposed upon the creators. Publishers necessarily gained from a matrix in which the more money an artist receives from a work, the less valuable the work is as a piece of art. At every juncture, Besant witnessed the exploitation of authors by publishers because of what he perceived to be mere ignorance of the facts regarding publication. What he could not see was that the authors could not denounce the exploitation - that is fully embrace the Society of Authors - without 'confessing their self-interested motives'. Bourdieu explains how certain publishers, in this instance Arnoux, the art-dealer in Flaubert's *Sentimental Education*, can take advantage of both economies to their greater advantage:

There is the logic of disinterested art, which knows only symbolic profits, and there is the logic of commerce: his duality, more profound than all manner of duplicity, allows him to catch artists at their own game, that of disinterestedness, confidence, generosity, friendship [. . .] and thereby to leave them the best part, the wholly symbolic profits of what they themselves call 'glory', reserving for himself the material profits made on their work.

(*Rules*, p. 9)

By asking authors to admit their financial interests Besant was challenging the structure of the field, and therefore it is not surprising that he failed. Yet, at all times he was working solely for authors, and his periodical *The Author* was produced **only** for other producers.

The Report of the Society of Authors for 1890 asked for suggestions for keeping members more informed about matters directly concerning authors, as well as the workings of the Executive Committee. The result was the publication of *The Author*, a magazine which Alvin Sullivan has subsequently classified as a 'major repository of information about the history of authorship over the past century'.⁵⁶ Throughout the 1890s, *The Author* became a forum for discussion of the changes in the literary field, including: the rationalisation of copyright; the establishment of a royalty system; the appearance of the literary agent; the demise of the three-decker and the standardisation of book prices.⁵⁷ Indeed, the last years of the nineteenth century saw an evolution in the literary market-place. Besant's constant focus on the financial aspects of the world of art in *The Author* placed him squarely, in the eyes of many, in the field of large-scale production.

While Besant never placed popular success above literary value, it was only ever work that would sell which he promoted for publication, in other words, work that would meet the demands of an audience. The third number of *The Author* discusses the cardinal sin for writers: paying for publication. Of all novels published in 1889, Besant estimates that at least two thirds had been paid for by their authors. Normally, such authors had initially approached and had their manuscript refused by a large and reputable publishing house. Now, accepting that

these large houses 'ardently desire to publish good work which they can sell', the author should realise that the refusal of his manuscript indicates that it lacks commercial value, if not literary merit.³⁸ In such circumstances Besant's advice is to revise the work and give it to an independent reader, 'say one of the readers for this Society' (p. 75). In reality, however, most spurned authors offer the same manuscript to smaller houses who rely on pre-payment. Besant wants the author to realise that *'there is only one public'*. If respectable publishing houses agree that the public will have none of it, 'where, then, is that other public which will demand it when it is published elsewhere?' (p. 75). The answer, within the terms of the field, is that it is in the field of restricted production, where position holders produce for producers, rather than consumers.

Two months later, in reply to this leaflet C. W. Radcliffe Cooke describes the manner in which he paid for the publication of his own book after refusals from publishing firms and a negative report from a reader from the Society. The book was eventually a success. Besant's reply admits that readers are not infallible, but insists on their value. He writes, that 'the reader is in a position to give the surest prognosis that can be given of a book', and that, furthermore, they have 'kept from publication [...] a mass of stuff which would never repay the author, and would only have swollen the mass of worthless literature' (p. 122). All through his argument Besant insists that the reader, as an indicator of mass taste, can judge the monetary value of a work and it is on this basis alone that a work should be published.

The moral to Besant's tale is that literary vanity will not be rewarded. Although he understands that novelists are encouraged by cases like Radcliffe Cooke, he warns that they are rare. Moreover, the cost of these vanities is borne by the field. Besant feels that 'the output of worthless books' is increased by one more 'each time an author pays for his own publication' and that the 'noble art of fiction is degraded and insulted' (p. 76). It is therefore, a 'noble' art which Besant feels he is

defending rather than cheapening by his emphasis on rewards legitimised in the field of large-scale production, suggesting, in agreement with Colby, that there was a conflict in Besant between his idealism and pragmatism.⁵⁹

In 'Literature as a Career' Besant's reflects upon the standards of literature, judging the highest type to be that read by 500-5000 people of the highest culture. However:

There is not a dozen living writers of our language who quite satisfy the standard of this small class. But there are lower standards - those which appeal to the better class whose literary taste is not so keen, or subtle, as those of the first class, yet is sound and wholesome. And there are lower standards, and lower still, till we reach the depths of the penny novelette, the journal which is a scrap-book, the halfpenny sheet of ballads. Yet it is all literature, the literature of the people, from highest to lowest. At no point on this ladder of the printed sheets can one stop and say, 'Here literature ends.'⁶⁰

Besant's view of literature dispenses with any need for the conflicts of valuation and legitimisation around which the field of cultural production is structured. His conflict was with the status of writers, in general, within society: what honours they received; how they could negotiate the best deal with a publisher. He conceived of the work being created in a sub-field totally independent of external demands, which then passed into another sub-field as a commodity to be bought and sold, neglecting the possibility that both sectors may be part of one whole field and thus, he was unable to 'play the game' effectively.

Criticism of Besant, where it exists, naturally does place him within the hierarchical structure of the field. Little is dedicated to him alone, placing him predominantly in opposition to other authors functioning at the time, as indeed I have done. However, most comparisons are less favourable. While Besant's 'Art of Fiction' may only be remembered for the response of James, Boege highlights that, 'unquestionably Besant appears at his worst when the two essays are placed side by side'.⁶¹ Even after death, Besant could not avoid being placed in contrast to Robert Buchanan, who together were 'as antipathetic as any two writers one might

think of'.⁶² Besant has been latterly constructed as an author against whom others may shine as symbols of autonomous authorship, while he continues to exist only as the man behind The Society of Authors.

The Creation of Henry James

Marcia Jacobson describes the image which James left for the critic as 'an aloof, self-sustained artist, governed by a devotion to style and a passion for form'.⁶³ This view of James may explain the discussion by Jamesian critics as to why James chose to re-use the title 'The Art of Fiction' in his reply to Besant. George Dekker wonders why he recycled the title when his approach was so different from Besant's, Peter Buitenhuis suggests that he is mocking Besant's own pretentiousness, while Daniel Schwarz proposes that it is because 'Besant's lecture expressed some of the critical shibboleths of the day'.⁶⁴ No-one accepts James's own, clearly stated explanation, that he repeated the title in order to reach a larger audience. Anxious not to 'lose the benefit of the favourable association', he hoped 'to edge in a few words under cover of the attention which Mr. Besant was sure to have excited' (p. 186). Michael Anesko explains that this idealised view of James the artist was perpetuated by friends after his death. Percy Lubbock and Theodora Besanquet are among those cited as creating the myth of his 'sublime indifference to an uncaring (if not callously stupid) reading public'.⁶⁵ For many years, therefore, James held a position similar to that of Biffen in the eyes of the critics. He pursued his art for its own sake without wishing, or needing, economic reparations.

Leon Edel revealed in his biography of James, that James did not profit from his family's fortune until his fifties.⁶⁶ This meant that he had actually lived from his literary work for a considerable amount of time and the financial aspect of James's character could no longer be ignored. The titles of recent publications show the direction Jamesian criticism has now taken: Jacobson's *Henry James and the Mass*

Media (1983), Anesko's *'Friction with the Market': Henry James and the Profession of Authorship* (1986) and most recently Salmon's *Henry James and the Culture of Publicity* (1997). The tide has turned and critics want to show that James not only acknowledged the market-place, but had a deep understanding of its commercial structure. Unlike, Besant he recognised the commerciality of 'disinterestedness'.

A recent article by Philip Horne has revealed the ways in which the market-place acted as a constraint upon James's literary productions, through an investigation of the relationship between the composition of his short stories and the word-limit imposed by magazines. He insists that James could not forego the fees which accompanied any magazine publication and, therefore, had to cut his stories down. This implies that James, like everyone else, was not impervious to external market demands because, as Horne points out, that while Reardon was fictionally struggling to fill three volumes, James was ironically fighting to reduce his wordage.⁶⁷ Horne describes the two distinct ways in which James uses the word 'economy'. The first 'is artistic and metaphorical, elevating the literary object above the market; the other commercial, calculating the cost of time spent and the value of money to be earned'.⁶⁸ That is, the first is the symbolic value of a cultural product, the second is its economic value.

It was imperative that James had the ability to compromise with external editorial demands, because as Anesko's breakdown of his earnings show, 'successful entry into the serial market was the key to his survival'.⁶⁹ As Edel concludes, 'his novels were in the periodicals, but in book form they didn't sell', yet to be constantly writing for the magazines was 'a burden James found humiliating' (*HJL*, p. xv). The reason for this may be that James's novels were published in periodicals, like *The Cornhill* and *Scribner's*, which were firmly part of the literary mainstream. The precarious position which James held in the field is shown in a letter which he wrote to Thomas Aldrich, the editor of the *Atlantic*

Monthly, about his forthcoming periodical publications. He mentions that *Century* have accepted three of his stories and continues:

And three or four short tales, from my turning hand, are to appear (this is a profound secret) - have been, in a word, secured, *à pix d'or* in - *je vous donne en mille* - the New York Sunday *Sun*! Please bury it in oblivion and burn my letter. I mention it, with preceding items, simply to denote that by July 1865 (sic) I expect to be in the enjoyment of a popularity which will require me to ask \$500 a number for the successive instalments of *The Princess Casamassima*.
(*HJL*, p. 25)⁷⁰

James is trying to do two things here. On the one hand he wants to present himself as a profitable investment, in monetary terms, to an editor. He talks of a popularity which can be measured in dollars, a concept of legitimisation in the field of large-scale production. However, simultaneously he recognises that this blatant avowal of the economy should not be made public. He must continue to appear 'disinterested', and indeed does seem ashamed of his alliance with the overtly audience-orientated *Sun*. It must be kept a secret, remain a private affair between 'men of business', and therefore not affect standing as an autonomous artist.

Other once private, now published letters display James's concurrent awareness of the economy and the value of its disavowal. In 1891 he wrote to his brother about the income which he was currently receiving from a play adapted from *The American*. Showing a newly acquired knowledge of the particular economics of the theatre, he suggests that, 'I go into these vulgarities (which *please* keep utterly to yourself . . .), I say I bore you with these details simply that you may not for the present look to me to ship over nuggets for investment under your eye' (*HJL*, p. 333). His assessment of monetary details had not changed by 1894, when writing to Grace Norton about Paul Bourget. Bourget's exaltation to the Academy has come at a time, James realises, 'to be so much wind in the sails (and in the sale - excuse my vulgarity!)' (*HJL*, p. 474). Each allusion to money which James makes establishes him as fully conscious of the 'business-side' of

literature, but wanting this aspect to remain concealed from the public, presenting it, even privately, as the 'vulgar' aspect of his work.

The recent publication of the correspondence between Henry James and the publisher Frederick Macmillan additionally portray him as an author very much aware of, and interested in, the monetary value of his work, while projecting a potentially much more valuable façade of disinterestedness. His knowledge of financial matters was doubtless deepened by his early involvement with The Society of Authors. He was an honorary American fellow from its inception and his experience with copyright both in Britain and America made him a valuable resource. Anesko argues that 'his special status as a transatlantic author placed him squarely between the forces of innovation and tradition and made him an ideal exponent for the professionalization of the literary vocation'.⁷¹ While Besant was a very public supporter of the Society, James kept a much lower profile. This led to less embarrassment when he later became disillusioned with the narrow focus of the Society.

It was James who initially approached Macmillan's publishing house, choosing wisely in terms of the field of cultural production. In *The Pen and the Book* Besant devoted a chapter to 'The Choice of a Publisher', wherein he advised the new author to take an interest in the lists and advertisements of publishers. Points to notice were whether they published reputed authors and did these authors stay with them? The choice of publisher is important in the field, not only because 'for each author, each form of production and product, there is a corresponding *natural site* in the field of cultural production', but because each publisher has differing levels of consecration within the field which are then accredited to their publications (*Field*, p. 95). Macmillan's had built themselves a reputation in 'serious' publishing, with names like Pater, Tennyson and Arnold on their books, and in 1880 Frederick Macmillan became the publisher of Henry James's first book in Britain, *French Poets and Novelists* (1878). The relationship lasted, to varying

degrees, until James's death in 1916.⁷² Rayburn S. Moore described the relationship between the author and publisher as one based on Macmillan's belief in James as a 'significant writer' but:

the relationship was nevertheless concurrently concerned with the usual hardheaded aspects of business - James's desire to get as much as possible for his output and Macmillan's working premise that both author and firm be served by the relationship.⁷³

The need to assume ambivalence towards, if not totally disregard, financial reward within these letters is reduced; James needs to portray himself as an author who sells, especially in the early stages of the partnership. For example, in 1878 James writes that his 'acute desire' for the next year is to make 'as much money as possible on the matter of the republication of "The American"'.⁷⁴

James initially had high expectations regarding the monetary value of his work. Despite the fact that *The Europeans* (1879) was remaindered after only three print runs of 250 and one 6 shilling edition of 1000, James remained optimistic. The contract for *The Europeans*, *Daisy Miller*, *The American* and *French Novelists* stated that Macmillan took all the risks and James would receive half-profits. Even if the profits were modest James contested that it was the start of his appearance before the 'British public as a novelist - as *the* novelist of the future, destined to extract from the B. P. eventually (both for himself & his publishers) a colossal fortune' (p. 16). There is truth in this statement, but James did not realise how long 'eventually' meant, and he continually asked Macmillan for royalties prematurely. He did not understand the extent of the time-lag in operation in the field of restricted production, whereby the investment in symbolic capital takes time to mature. Even in publications produced for larger audiences, James, unrealistically, expected instant financial reward. In 1879 he wrote from Paris to request the money due to him for completing the *Hawthorne* volume for the EML. He is

apologetic, 'Excuse my appearance of dunning you - but I am rather in the want of the money' (p. 43).

Also in 1879, unsatisfied with the small returns that he had been receiving from Macmillan's, James started looking for another publisher for his next book, *Confidence*. As with all his books, *Confidence* had already appeared in serial form, this time in *Scribner's Magazine*, and when it came to negotiating volume rights James, therefore, approached Charles Scribner and asked him to make him an offer. In this way James ascertained how much his work was worth to a publisher and, consequently, what he could demand for it. Scribner's offer alerted him to the important fact that he could receive a certain amount of money in advance. With this knowledge James managed to acquire higher terms in Britain from Chatto and Windus, the eventual publisher of *Confidence*. Anesko speculates that he turned to Chatto and Windus instead of Macmillan because he felt the 'tactic of desertion might get him better terms on future books'.⁷⁵

By 1884 James was still not satisfied with the small amount of money he was receiving from Macmillan. He wrote to his publisher in search of a more fruitful arrangement having contemplated his statement of account. He had thought the payment would be small, 'but I now perceive them to be virtually *nil*. The balance owing me is £2.17.6 - for a year's sale of some seven or eight books' (p. 50). In 1887, with financial concerns dominating, James suggested the collection and publication of some critical articles he had written. It would include 'The Art of Fiction' but should only be considered 'if for such a volume', he could 'get some money' (p. 128). It is interesting that it is Mudie's, the embodiment of Victorian values and the field of large-scale production, which seems to keep James afloat. The circulating library bought 100 copies of *Washington Square* in 1881 and 150 copies of *The Reverberator* in 1888.

The conflict between what James thought he deserved for his work and what Macmillan felt it had earned reached its climax in 1890. Macmillan offered James

two-third profits with no royalties and no down payment for the publication of *The Tragic Muse*. James was rightly perturbed. This was reminiscent of the first contracts he had ever signed with Macmillan and since then he had come to expect more. As recently as 1886, Macmillan had paid him £500 in advance for *The Bostonians*. James had to reject Macmillan's latest offer because for him the future was remote, 'What I desire is a sum "down" - & I am loth to perish without a struggle - that is without trying to obtain one' (p. 159). With those words he bade farewell to Macmillan. Macmillan justified his offer as a guard against loss, resulting from the 'fact that the commercial result of the last few books we have published for you has been anything but satisfactory' (p. 159). The problem was that James's sales had rarely exceeded the generous advances which Macmillan had been paying.⁷⁶

In *The Pen and the Book* Besant provided a contemporary view of the stages of literary success based purely on the numbers of copies printed and sold: the lowest level is when the book would die but for the circulating libraries stocking it; a meagre margin of profit is gained if circulation reaches 600; if demand ceases after an edition of 2000 has sold then an author can expect £200, but he is not seen to have gained 'considerable popularity' until between 5000 -10, 000 copies are sold. Occasionally there occurs what Besant terms as a 'boom', when there is great and spontaneous demand for thousands. In 1888 Macmillan published three James publications. For Britain they printed 650 copies of *The Aspern Papers*, 200 copies of *Partial Portraits* and 500 copies of *The Reverberator*. In comparison, the same year they ran an edition of 1500 for Tennyson's *Idylls of the Kings* and 7000 for a one volume collection of his complete works. It would seem that despite his interest and need for money James's work was not selling. In line with conflicting principles of legitimisation in the field of cultural production, however, his lack of popularity did breed the opposing brand of success. By the 1890s James became aware of 'a generation of attractive young men, gifted and appreciative, only too

willing to be acolytes and to hail him as "Master".⁷⁷ He had the reputation craved in the sub-field of restricted production, but still he hampered after the rewards only available in the field of large-scale production.

Salmon concludes that any critical attempt to view James as either an aloof aesthete or an aspiring popular writer is 'both equally inadequate and equally compelling'.⁷⁸ His literary projects between 1890 and 1895 demonstrate the divisions in James's ambitions. He left Macmillan's to concentrate on the theatre, while simultaneously writing his tales of 'literary life'. Drama is the genre perhaps most influenced by external demands; it is hard to deny the importance of the presence, or lack of, an audience. James knew that entering the world of theatre would not enhance his authorial standing, but hoped it would increase his revenue. He wrote to Stevenson concerning his new interest:

Don't despise me too much if I confess that *anch' io son pittore, je fais aussi du théâtre, moi* [. . .]. Don't be too hard on me - simplifying and chastening necessity has laid its brutal hand on me and I have had to try and make somehow or other the money I don't make by literature. My books don't sell, and it looks as if my plays might.
(HJL, p. 326)

It was not only money which James sought, however. Anesko points to the joy which James experienced during the standing ovation he received at the opening of *The American* in 1891.⁷⁹ Writing to his brother after this success, he confesses that, 'now that I have tasted blood, *c'est une rage* (of determination to *do*, and triumph, on my part), for I feel at last as if I had found my *real* form, which I am capable of carrying far' (HJL, p. 329). James wanted mass acclaim.

James realised that in order to retain what reputation he had earned, however he had to justify his dramatic phase in other terms; to have it based only on external demands would degrade it and himself, in his eyes, the eyes of his friends and family and the eyes of the field. In answer to this James initially saw honour and inspiration arising from drama's difficulty, 'if it were *easy* to write a good play

I couldn't and wouldn't think of it; but it is in fact damnably hard [. . .] and that constitutes a solid respectability - guarantee's one's *intellectual* self-respect' (HJL, p. 329). Later, he could no longer justify his work in that way. He wished to separate drama, the work, from theatre, the conditions of production, in the same way in which Besant separated symbolic from monetary reward, but he cannot. He feels that he '*may* be made for Drama (God only knows!) but [. . .] not made for Theatre', condemning at another time the 'connection between the drama and the theatre' because 'the one is admirable in its interest and difficulty, the other is loathsome in its conditions' (HJL, p. 503 & 449). James realised that the two could not be separated so entirely, they were connected; the drama could not be 'theoretically or hypothetically acted' in order to retain its artistic integrity and James began to resent changes which theatre proprietors, directors and even actors constantly suggested. He began to yearn, once more, for the relative independence from external demands offered by fiction-writing.

1895 saw the culmination of James's time as a playwright. While his new play *Guy Domville* opened on 5 January in the Haymarket Theatre in London, James watched Wilde's *An Ideal Husband*, which had debuted earlier that week to great acclaim. Edel insists that there were two audiences watching James's play that night. The first consisted of literary people who came prepared to applaud James, the second had merely come to be entertained.⁸⁰ In Bourdieu's terms there was both an audience of producers and an audience of consumers and James returned to the Haymarket in time to be booed and hissed from the stage by the latter.

In a letter to his brother four days after *Guy Domville*'s opening night, James separates public and private opinion of the play. He divulges that 'all *private* opinion is apparently one of extreme admiration' while the papers have been 'mainly ill-natured and densely stupid and vulgar'. His initial observation culminates in contempt for the general public, concluding that if the basis for being

a play, and a successful one, is displayed by Wilde's work, then *Guy Domville* 'is necessarily neither' (*HJL*, p. 508-9).

His sojourn with drama in the first five years of the 1890s was a conscious attempt to gain mass recognition and as Jacobson argues 'was also enough to dispel his naïveté about his popular appeal'.⁸¹ He discovered that even when he tried he did not hold the key to mass appeal at that time. He wrote to Edward Compton:

I have a general strong impression of my constitutional inability to (even in spite of intense and really abject effort) *realise* the sort of simplicity that the promiscuous British public finds its interest in - much more, after this indispensable realisation, to *achieve* it. Even when I think I am dropping most diplomatically to the very rudiments and stooping, with a vengeance, to conquer, I am as much 'out of it' as ever, and far above their unimaginable heads.

(*HJL*, p. 413)

Therefore, Henry James can be viewed as representative of the internal conflict between a desire for symbolic reward on the one hand and monetary gain on the other, a complex combination of 'artistic ability and pecuniary ambition'.⁸² Salmon highlights this tension within James:

On the one hand, he writes a series of fictional tales which consecrate, however ironically, the distance between the solitary artist and the 'vulgar' public, and addresses them to an elite readership of avant-garde periodicals such as *The Yellow Book*; on the other hand, he is actively engaged in cultivating a popular audience within the theatre.⁸³

Here, Salmon introduces the secondary literary pursuit undertaken by James at this time, his stories on literary life, and it is out of these tales that the myth of James as an autonomous author grew.

Henry James's approach to the field differed from Walter Besant's. He realised the value which a disinterestedness in monetary reward could accrue within the field of literary production.⁸⁴ A conscious wish to appear disinterested was

supplemented by a lack of respect for the mass audience, which in itself had been compounded by his theatrical disaster. James had no doubt that it was the audience, not the play which was at fault. Thus it was a 'howling mob' who attacked his 'ingenious play', because it presented 'to the uncivilized the unpardonable anomaly of not belonging to the kind which they know' (*HJL*, p. 510). James did not share Besant's 'paternal' faith in popular education, but preferred, like Gissing, to blame the overcrowded literary market on the widening access to education. In 1896 'The Next Time' became the first piece of work published by James after the disastrous performance of *Guy Domville* and it castigates the 'monstrous' public and its tastes. In his Prefaces he judged that it was 'in essence a "story about the public," only wearing a little the reduced face [. . .] of the monstrous countenance itself'.⁸⁵ It tells the tale of an author who cannot write badly enough to produce either a best-seller, or be a successful journalist despite his increasingly desperate attempts.

In 'The Next Time' James presents two novelists with diametrically opposed problems. Ray Limbert is struggling to earn a living from authorship so that he can marry his sweetheart. Unfortunately, he continually produces works of high symbolic value which do not sell. In contrast, Mrs Highmore, his fiancée's sister, is a popular novelist who yearns to be 'of course only once, an exquisite failure'.⁸⁶ In her characterisation, as Anne Margolis suggests, James creates a type of literary producer who realises that there are some members of the public 'whose esteem can be won only at the cost of pecuniary failure', thus recognising the 'non-pecuniary advantages and possibilities of a novel which fails to sell'.⁸⁷ She is conscious of the dual economy of the field, aware of two types of audience, as well as two types of success. The narrator is the third writer in the story. He is the critic whose praise kills; if he loves a novel it will never be popular. Mrs Highmore reflects that 'reputation was seeing [*him*] toss a flower' (p. 309). The narrative explores each of Limbert's attempts to 'cultivate the market' (p. 331), playing with

conceptions of success. Limbert's exasperated plea, 'Success be hanged! - I want to sell', places success and money in mutually exclusive realms (p. 331).

Besant has suggested that a successful writer must attempt to 'catch the manner of his generation', and Limbert realises this. He acquires a post on *The Blackport Beacon*, a periodical 'sketchily classified as literary', in which he is required to be 'lively' (p. 315). The narrator is shocked at how effectively Limbert can write what the masses want. He realises that the 'tone was of course to be caught, but need it have been caught so in the act?' (p. 316). He is, therefore, astonished to learn that Limbert has been removed from his position and having obtained the news from Limbert's fiancée, he questions her as to what it was that the paper had wanted:

'Something more chatty.'
 'More?' I cried aghast.
 'More gossipy, more personal. They want 'journalism'. They
 want tremendous trash.'
 'Why that's just what his letters have *been*!' I broke out.
 This was strong, and I caught myself up, but the girl offered me
 the pardon of a beautiful wan smile.

(p. 318)

The irony is that deeming Limbert's letters trash is not an insult. In these circumstances trash, paradoxically, would have been good. Limbert had thought that through a conscious vulgarising of his work he had achieved the ultimate low, but he had still failed to create public appeal.

Equally, his position on a periodical for the 'better' readers is terminated after a year because he had overdone the 'intellectual power' of his articles. They 'reeked with culture. He keyed it up too high' (p. 338), and his fiction writing bears up no better to the wishes of the populace:

It converted readers into friends and friends into lovers; it placed the author, as the phrase is - placed him all too definitely; but it shrank to obscurity in the account of sales eventually rendered. It was in short an exquisite thing, but it was scarcely a thing to have published and certainly not a thing to have married on.

(p. 324)

All Limbert's attempts to write best-sellers end in artistic masterpieces destined to add to his reputation but to receive little immediate financial reward. James implies that only a lower form of art will attract the masses, but despite Mrs Highmore's advice on how a reputation might be 'worked', Limbert still 'can't be vulgar for trying' (p. 343).

Highmore and Limbert are trapped in their positions. Mrs Highmore cannot fail to be popular for 'the public *would* have her' and Limbert cannot succeed at being vulgar. Richard Salmon summarises their situations:

Whereas Limbert needs to achieve commercial success for financial reasons, Highmore envies the cultural prestige that is accrued by 'failure' in the market. Both writers strive to achieve their opposing definitions of 'success' (or 'failure'), and both fail (or perversely succeed), but to opposite effects.⁸⁸

Highmore is trapped in the field of large-scale production as Limbert is trapped in the field of restricted production. Limbert is not dismissive of the mass audience, but is actively seeking its approval in order to survive. Unlike Biffen and Milvain, these fictional characters are not content with the position imposed upon them by the reading public. For Limbert and Highmore the field is not a place of possible positions, each being predisposed to remain in their initial position.

The story appeared in the *Yellow Book* which, itself, demonstrates further contradictions of the 'anti-economy' of the field. The *Yellow Book* was seen as the epitome of the elitist strand of the art world in the 1890s, yet its history gives credence to Besant's assertion that every writer will take as much money as he can for his work. Katherine Leon Mix explains that 'three men controlled the destinies of the [periodical] - John Lane, publisher, Aubrey Beardsley, art editor, and Henry Harland, literary editor'.⁸⁹ Under the Bodley Head, John Lane published new writers. The press in Vigo Street took pride not only in the content of the books but paid particular attention to their covers and bindings. Beardsley was a young artist

who had made a name for himself when he illustrated J. M. Dent's new edition of Malory's *Morte d'Arthur*, and whom Lane had previously commissioned to illustrate Oscar Wilde's *Salomé*. Lastly, Henry Harland was an American writer, one of the growing generation, who 'had long considered Henry James his master'.⁹⁰

In his Prefaces James recalls his pleasure at being told that there would be no word limit imposed upon any short story he submitted to the *Yellow Book*. He writes he had so often struggled to produce short stories 'under the rude prescription of brevity at any cost [. . .] that my friend's emphasised indifference of length struck me, I remember, as the fruit of the finest artistic intelligence'.⁹¹ The colour for the book was deliberate. Alvin Sullivan puts forward two main reasons. First, yellow was the colour associated with the *livres jaunes* which encased the works of the French naturalists. Second, in Wilde's *Portrait of Dorian Gray* a character picks up one such yellow book, describing it as 'the strangest book that he had ever read'.⁹² It was to be a literary and artistic magazine in which James would be asked to contribute, while Wilde would not. Each volume would take the form of a book with a hard cover, containing three hundred pages. The first edition of 5000 copies appeared on the 15 April 1894, selling at five shilling.

The audience was expected to be small. *However, there was expected to be an audience.* Harland's marketing ploy, as Philip Horne suggests, was 'to appeal to a section of the market which saw itself as separate from the philistine commercialism of the age'.⁹³ Despite its avant-garde pretensions the periodical was a financial project, shown by the efforts to retain readers after the Wilde trial in 1895. All the early efforts to disassociate the *Yellow Book* from Wilde were wrecked when it transpired that Wilde had been holding a yellow book when he was arrested. It was later confirmed that this was one of *livres jaunes* and not a volume of the periodical, but the damage was done. The public outrage at Wilde was transferred to the *Yellow Book* and specifically at Aubrey Beardsley.

Beardsley was sacked and his illustrations for the fifth volume, already in press, were removed.

Volume six of the *Yellow Book* was the first one to be arranged after the trial. Mix suggests that Harland 'wished to make it so innocuous as to attract no unfavourable comment, but so interesting as to compensate for the loss of Beardsley'.⁹⁴ Harland was actively seeking an audience suggesting that even the most disinterested seek success. Ironically, in order to attract readers, Harland approached James. It was 'The Next Time' which introduced the new dawn of the *Yellow Book*, a dawn which lasted until 1897. In the beginning the periodical had been a financial success, but by its thirteenth volume there was no longer any demand for it.⁹⁵ However elitist a work of art it professed itself to be, the *Yellow Book* crumbled under public pressure. It is this tension between symbolic and monetary success which Bourdieu insists is the greatest conflict in the field. Symbolic success can only be chased by those in the field who have the independent means to support it.

In his literary work, James presents success as a commodity which cannot be judged by mass appeal. This is not only a result of his low opinion of the popular audience, but because he recognises the investment to be made in the field through a disavowal of the normal economic world. What he cannot do, however, is wait until that investment matures. Autonomy from all economic pressures can only be accomplished through independent wealth or generous benefactors. Therefore, he is a character actively seeking the highest financial rewards, but assuming disinterestedness. Randal Johnson points out that no one intentionally enters the field to lose, no matter how disinterested they may appear or indeed think they are.⁹⁶ Few, indeed, can afford to.

Edel warns that it is no use trying to 'find any consistency in James's utterances' as he embarked upon his career as a dramatist. However, if they are viewed, as I have attempted to, as manifestations of the opposing systems of

valuation at work within the field of cultural production at the time, a rationale begins to take form. That James wrote that he hated 'too much the horrid aspect and company' of the *Yellow Book*, should be questioned, however, because, like James, it can be seen as operating in a sub-sub-field which embraced these conflicting principles. Anesko reiterates the idea that mass production is a necessity behind autonomy:

the same conditions which gave rise to the mass audience fostered the recognition that smaller, more discriminating publics existed in tandem with it and might be capable of supporting writers of distinction.⁹⁷

In this way it can be argued that James, like the proprietors of the *Yellow Book* was seeking a restricted audience within the field of large-scale production.

The field of literary production is the site 'of struggles in which what is at stake is the power to impose the dominant definition of the writer' (*Field*, p. 42). Each participant wants to acquire a legitimate voice in literary matters. Both Besant and James, as participants in this arena, defined their perception of the author throughout their lives in many ways, perceptions which conflicted with the ideas of other 'legitimate' voices and with each other. The 'Art of Fiction' debate, however, does not just situate them within a common field, but identifies a common enemy within their struggle; the literary critic.

Towards the end of Besant's lecture he casts his judgement on the critics. He feels 'irritated when the critics begin to appraise, compare, and estimate' writers like Dickens and Scott. He thinks that 'there is nothing [. . .] that we can give them but admiration that is unspeakable, gratitude that is silent' (p. 85). James, in his reply, laments the classifications which critics seem intent on placing around works of fiction. In his opinion such groupings are reductive:

The novel and the romance, the novel of incident and that of the character - these clumsy separations appear to me to have been made by critics and readers for their own convenience [. . .] but to have little reality or interest for the producer, from whose point of view it is of course that we are attempting to consider the art of fiction.

(p. 197)

James points, for justification, at the completeness of the French theory of fiction and the fact that they have 'but one name for the novel' (p. 198).

By criticising critics or the audience authors renounce the rest of the field, claiming the superiority of the author. It is the producer whose point of view matters, and for James, importantly, the producer is the writer alone. Besant and James's condemnation of critics continued throughout their careers. In Besant's autobiography Sprigge explains that Besant 'was hurt and annoyed with a certain class of critics because, as he conceived their duty, they had no proper qualifications' (*Auto*, p.xiii). Besant 'believed, and probably more than occasionally with some justice, that the airs of omniscience concealed depths of ignorance' (*Auto*, p. xiv). For him a true critic made judgements which were lessons to both the reader and the author. He was never spiteful, 'nor smart', nor derisive but observed 'courtesy even in condemnation' (*Auto*, p. 183). The problem was that these true critics were 'as rare as a true poet' (*Auto*, p. 185).

Early in his career James had sought the views of critics, but by 1896 his stance had changed.⁹⁸ He wrote to Macmillan:

I am much obliged to you for your remittances of cuttings from the American newspapers on the subject of *Embarrassments* - but reproach myself with not having originally mentioned to you that I would not trouble you to send me any reviews - as I have for a long time made a point of making - with my books - this request. Kindly, when *The Other House* is published, neglect, as far as I am concerned, the reviews, I mean please *don't* send them.

(p. 184)

This highlights James's positive antipathy to reviews specifically, and critics in general. He also demonstrates this attitude through his fiction. 'The Figure in the Carpet' is a story which Frank Kermode suggests portrays the 'critic as enemy'.⁹⁹

The scene is set when the narrator, a young critic, is told to review Vereker's new novel. The reviewer does not know what the new book will do for Vereker's reputation but he is 'clear on the spot' what it will do for his own, insinuating that critics gain their reputation through the hard work of authors.¹⁰⁰ This is reiterated when Vereker insists that the critic is not a plain man because if he were 'what would he be doing in his neighbour's garden?' (p. 367). The young critic, having written a review of the novel, then meets Vereker at a social gathering and defines the novelist's position:

He wasn't of course popular, but I judged one of his sources of humour to be precisely that his success was independent of that. He had none the less become in a manner the fashion; the critics at least had put on a spurt and caught up with him. We had found out at last how clever he was, and he had to make the best of the loss of his mystery.

(p. 360)

This self-imposed position of superiority which he creates for the critics is quickly destroyed by Vereker.

Vereker has not read the review. It transpires that he does not read reviews unless they are thrust upon him as his hostess has just done. He admits:

I used to read them sometimes, ten years ago. I dare say they were in general rather stupider then; at any rate it always struck me they missed my little point with a perfection exactly as admirable when they patted me on the back as when they kicked me in the shins. Whenever since I've happened to have a glimpse of them they are still blazing away - still missing it, I mean deliciously.

(p. 364-5)

The irony of the narrator's self-satisfaction becomes clear when it emerges that like all those critics before him, he too has failed to 'catch up with him'. Every critic misses the main point which a writer is trying to make, the point being, as Vereker explains, the particular thing he has written the book *for*. The critic, in an effort to understand, makes the analogy of a complex figure in a Persian carpet, of which Vereker approves but also offers his own; 'it is the very string [. . .] that my pearls are strung on!' (p. 374).

The rest of the story recounts the quest to discover this 'figure in the carpet'. When the critic chastises the author for not assisting critics, Vereker blasts 'Assist him? What else have I done with every stroke of my pen? I've shouted my intention in his great blank face' (p. 366). The essence of Vereker's work is never revealed to the reader, but James's critique of the critic is clear. The impression left is that the literary critic's work is worthless. To James and Besant most critics do not have a legitimate voice in literary matters. Their reputation and thus part of their value, therefore, rested in the hands of critics for whom they had no respect.¹⁰¹

Their shared opinion of critics illustrates that, although they were engaged in different positions, they both functioned within the same field, shaped by the same forces. The 'Art of Fiction' is one explicit example of their shared experience of the field. James brings himself, voluntarily, into conflict with Besant. The profitability of such a direct collision was recognised by the publisher Copples, Upham and Company which published the two articles bound together in 1884. A perhaps more unwelcome association of the two authors had previously occurred. In 1880 an unauthorised publishing of *A Bundle of Letters* by James and *Sweet Nelly, My Heart's Desire* by Besant and Rice appeared as volume 34 of the weekly *Seaside Library* published by George Munro.

In his article on James, Horne proposes that there are 'conflicting economies in the world of literature, and the poetic economy of art has to operate, for the

professional writer, within the larger, more prosaic business of earning a living'.¹⁰²

Both Besant and James, as products of the field of cultural production, with its inherent 'conflicting economies', had to find a way in which they could cope with the economic and symbolic concerns. Besant wanted to dispel the idea that accepting money for art diminished the art. Effectively, he wanted to destroy the system of misrecognition which allowed the 'anti-economic' dimension of the field to exist, which was impossible. Equally impossible was James's attempt to remain disinterested in the field without the safety net of wealth. Additionally, each had to continually justify their positions in an effort to gain a level of understanding which they did not feel was being produced for them by other voices in the field.

It was James who mastered the art of creating his own criticism in the Prefaces to the New York edition. These well-thought out and detailed analyses can be compared to the pages in Besant's autobiography which concern his ideas on his novels. Summing up *The Inner House* as 'an allegory in which it is shown that everything worth having in life depends upon death, the appointed end', Besant seems more intent on deriding critics than providing the tools for closer analysis. He continues that 'one reviewer said it was an attack on socialism. Twenty others immediately followed suit, glad of a chance of noticing without reading' (*Auto*, p. 212). While James's Prefaces have attracted as much interest as his literature, helping furthermore to create his autonomous exterior, Besant's remarks have been condemned as 'as superficial and irrelevant as much of the material in the works themselves'.¹⁰³

A lack of faith in the critic's ability to interpret art led to artists creating their own criticism through the publication of essays like 'The Art of Fiction' or Prefaces, but some preferred to let their literature do all the explaining. In the next chapter J. M. Barrie's often relegated position of 'popular novelist' is examined through a close analysis of some of his journalism and *Sentimental Tommy*. The following pages discover that reflected through the structures of the field of

cultural production, like Besant and James, Barrie's position is more complicated than generally thought.

Endnotes: Chapter Three

¹ Walter Besant, *Autobiography of Sir Walter Besant*, pref. note by S. Squire Sprigge (London: Hutchinson, 1902), p. 227-8. Further references to this book are given after quotations in the text marked, *Auto*.

² Peter D. McDonald, *British Literary Culture and Publishing Practice, 1880-1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 13.

³ McDonald, p. 13

⁴ For the purposes of this thesis 'disinterestedness' refers to the specific disinterest in financial reward for literary work as used by Bourdieu.

⁵ Paul DiMaggio, 'Review Essay: On Pierre Bourdieu', *American Journal of Sociology*, 84 (1978-9), 1460-74 (p. 1463).

⁶ Robert Louis Stevenson, 'A Humble Remonstrance' in *Selected Short Stories of R. L. Stevenson*, ed. by Ian Campbell (Edinburgh: Ramsay Head Press, 1980), 31-39 (p. 86).

⁷ Mark Spilka, 'Henry James and Walter Besant: "The Art of Fiction" Controversy' *Novel*, 6 (1973), 101-119 (p. 101). Spilka proceeds to give a brief résumé of the main participants in the debate including Andrew Lang, R. H. Hutton and the discussion as reopened by the *New Review* in 1895. See also Vivien Jones, *James the Critic* (London: Macmillan, 1995), p. 123-4, on the place of Howells' lecture,

⁸ William Dean Howells, 'Henry James Jr.' in *Century*, 3 (1882), 27-29, republished in *Life in Letters of William Dean Howells*, ed. by Mildred Howells, 2 vols. (New York: Doubleday, Doran & Co., 1928), 327-8 (p. 327).

⁹ *Henry James Letters*, ed. by Leon Edel, 1883-1895, 4 vols. (London: Macmillan, 1974-84), III (1980), p. 240. Further references to letters from Henry James are taken from this volume and given after references in the text, marked *HJL*.

¹⁰ Jones, p. 115.

¹¹ Nigel Cross, *The Common Writer: Life in Nineteenth Century Grub Street* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), p. 217.

¹² Henry James, 'The Art Of Fiction' in *The Critical Muse: Selected Literary Criticism*, ed. by Roger Gard (London: Penguin, 1987), 186-208 (p. 186-7). Further references to this article are given after quotations in the text.

¹³ Walter Besant, *The Art of Fiction*, new edn. (London: Chatto and Windus, 1902), p. 6. Further references to this essay are given after quotations in the text.

¹⁴ Spilka, p. 103-4.

¹⁵ Spilka, p. 104.

¹⁶ Stevenson was enjoying the immense success of *Treasure Island* making him popular with the audience, but alienating some authors. Gissing, having read James's *Partial Portraits* (1888), admitted that he could not read the paper on Stevenson. He writes, 'I hate to see his name, and certainly shall never bring myself to read one of his books', George Gissing, *London and the Life of Literature in Late Victorian England: The Diary of George Gissing*, ed. by Pierre Coustillas (Sussex: Harvester, 1978), p. 33. Stevenson also appreciated the importance of the audience. In 'Letter to a Young Gentleman who Proposes to Embrace the Career of Art', Stevenson writes, 'It is doubtless tempting to exclaim against the ignorant bourgeois; yet it should not be forgotten, it is he who pays us, and that (surely on the face of it) for services that he shall desire to have performed [. . .]. To give the public what they do not want, and yet expect to be supported: we have there a strange pretension, and yet not uncommon', in Robert Louis Stevenson, *Essays: Literary and Critical* (London: Heinemann, 1923), 3-11 (p. 7).

¹⁷ Jones, p. 120.

¹⁸ George Dekker, 'James and Stevenson: The Mixed Current of Realism and Romance', in *Critical Reconstructions: The Relationship of Fiction and Life*, ed.

by Robert M. Polhemus & Roger B. Henkle (California: Stanford University Press, 1994), 127-49 (p. 135).

¹⁹ Stevenson, 'A Humble Remonstrance', p. 31.

²⁰ See Spilka, p. 115.

²¹ Jones, p. 128. Jones also suggests that Besant's failure to mention the French novel within his lecture betrayed his insularity to James, a trait which James condemned, implicitly, by drawing examples from French literature. Criticism of Besant on this front seems slightly unfair. Besant started his career as a specialist in French literature, his first book publication being a collection of essays entitled *French Humorists* in 1873. Further, he does mention Victor Hugo late on in an essay, regardless of which is surely not meant to be totally representative in the way that James's is.

²² See Letter dated 5 December 1884 from Henry James to Robert Louis Stevenson, *Henry James Letters*, III, p. 57-8. In this letter to RLS, James continues, 'I read only last night your paper in the December *Longman's* in genial rejoinder to my article in the same periodical on Besant's lecture, and the result of that charming half-hour is a friendly desire to send you three words. Not words of discussion, dissent, retort or remonstrance, but of hearty sympathy, charged with the assurance of my enjoyment of everything you write', p. 58.

²³ Stevenson, 'A Humble Remonstrance', p. 31.

²⁴ N. N. Feltes, *Literary Capital and the Late Victorian Novel* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1993), p. 66.

²⁵ Michael Anesko, 'Friction with the Market': *Henry James and the Profession of Authorship* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), p. 88.

²⁶ Sarah B. Daugherty, *The Literary Criticism of Henry James* (Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1981), p. 139.

²⁷ Anesko, p. 4.

²⁸ John Goode, 'The Art of Fiction: Walter Besant and Henry James', in *Tradition and Tolerance in Nineteenth Century Fiction*, ed. by David Howard, John Lucas & John Goode (London: Routledge & Kegan, 1966), 207-41 (p. 257).

²⁹ Jones, p. 124.

³⁰ Spilka, p. 101.

³¹ Leon Edel, *Henry James: The Middle Years, 1884-1894* (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1963), p. 61.

³² Leslie Stephen, 'Authors for Hire', *The Cornhill Magazine*, 43 (1881), 684-702 (p. 687).

³³ Statistics provided by Cathy Grieve, Stockbridge Books, Edinburgh.

³⁴ Robert A. Colby, 'Harnessing Pegasus: Walter Besant, *The Author* and the Profession of Authorship', *Victorian Periodicals Review*, 23 (1990), 111-20 (p. 11).

³⁵ This is Bridget Fowler's synopsis of Bourdieu's theory of social ageing, in *Pierre Bourdieu and Cultural Theory: Critical Investigations* (London: Sage Publications, 1997), p. 79. Bourdieu writes that the 'value of cultural products tends to decrease with the advance of consecration', therefore, immediate popularity would equal immediate loss of value, *Rules*, p. 254.

³⁶ Walter Besant, *The Pen and the Book* (London: Thomas Burleigh, 1899), p. 15. Further references to this book are given after quotations in the text marked, *Pen*.

³⁷ 'Two Writers', *The Academy*, 60 (1901), 515-6 (pp. 515 & 516).

³⁸ 'Two Writers', p. 516.

³⁹ Fred W. Boege, 'Sir Walter Besant: Novelist (Part Two)', *Nineteenth Century Fiction*, 11 (1956-7), 32-60 (p. 60).

⁴⁰ McDonald, p. 11.

⁴¹ Fred, W. Boege, 'Sir Walter Besant: Novelist (Part One)', *Nineteenth Century Fiction*, 10 (1955-6), 249-280 (p. 250); Boege (2), p. 50.

⁴² Victor Bonham-Carter, *Authors by Profession*, 2 vols. (London: The Society of Authors, 1978-84), I, p. 126.

⁴³ See, Spilka, p. 103; Boege (1), p. 250; Lewis Melville, *Victorian Novelists* (London: Constable, 1906), p. 292.

⁴⁴ Great interest naturally prevailed upon this issue. In 1906 Melville argues that Rice was the source of most of the positive aspects of the work: characterisation; lightness; humour, p. 302. More convincingly, in 1956, Boege suggests that Besant's reluctance to divulge information was to protect Rice. He writes that 'Though one would certainly not wish to say that Besant was responsible for everything bad in their novels, obviously a disparity existed between the literary ability of the two men, which helps us to understand why Besant, despite the success of his own collaboration (for their novels were very popular) advised "decidedly against" it', Boege (1), p. 255.

⁴⁵ Walter Besant & James Rice, *The Golden Butterfly: A Novel* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1887), p. 337.

⁴⁶ John Stokes writes that Max Nordau published *Degeneration* hoping to prove that all modern artists were driven by what Stokes summarises as 'an abnormal pulse which they then attempted to conceal with the fraudulent 'Aesthetic' tenet that art had nothing to do with ethics', *In the Nineties* (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Press, 1989), p. 12.

⁴⁷ *George Gissing's Commonplace Book*, ed. by Jacob Korg (New York: New York Public Library, 1962), p. 67.

⁴⁸ Richard Salmon, *Henry James and the Culture of Publicity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 52.

⁴⁹ This follows on from his statement in 'The Art of Fiction' that he envisioned literature as the 'universal teacher', p. 19.

⁵⁰ Walter Besant, 'Literature as a Career', in *Essays and Historiettes* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1903), 308-336 (p. 330-1) Further references to this article are given after quotations in the text marked, *Essays*.

⁵¹ These objectives were stated in *The Author*, 1 (1890), p. 24.

⁵² Besant was especially proud of two publications by the Society. *Methods of Publishing* gave examples and explanations of actual agreements and *Cost of Production* broke down the literal costs incurred by publishers during publication. With these two books Besant believed the Society had, 'rendered a very signal service to the author. He now understands what kind of property he holds in his MS', (*Auto*, p. 236).

⁵³ S. Squire Sprigge, *The Methods of Publishing* (London: Henry Glaisner, 1890), title-page.

⁵⁴ Colby, p. 114-5.

⁵⁵ Paul F. Mattheissen, Arthur C. Young, and Pierre Coustillas, eds., *The Collected Letters of George Gissing*, 9 vols. (Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1990-1997), VI (1995), p. 18.

⁵⁶ Alvin Sullivan, *British Literary Magazines: The Victorian and Edwardian Age, 1837-1913* (London: Greenwood, 1984), p. 27.

⁵⁷ Colby, p. 114.

⁵⁸ *The Author*, 1, (1890), p. 75. Further references to this volume are given after quotations in the text.

⁵⁹ Cross, p. 212. But Gissing also admits that Besant had improved the payment of authors, failing to realise, in the way that Besant did, that one could not be achieved without the other; Colby, p. 115.

⁶⁰ Besant, 'Literature as a Career', p. 310.

⁶¹ Boege (2), p. 38.

⁶² Boege (2), p. 46.

⁶³ Marcia Jacobson, *Henry James and the Mass Market* (Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1983), p. 1.

⁶⁴ Dekker, p. 129; Peter Buitenhuis, 'Henry James's *The Art of Fiction* in its European Context', *Revue Française D'Etudes Américaines*, 8 (1983) 217-25 (p. 218); Daniel R. Schwarz, 'James's Theory of Fiction and its Legacy', in *A Companion to Henry James Studies*, ed. by David Mark Fogel (London: Greenwood, 1993), 39-53 (p. 42).

⁶⁵ Anesko, p. 4.

⁶⁶ It was not until the death of his sister Alice, and her legacy to James of \$20,000, in March 1892, that James acquired the money necessary to be an autonomous artist.

⁶⁷ Horne, pp. 4 & 9.

⁶⁸ Horne, p. 6.

⁶⁹ Anesko, p. 167.

⁷⁰ This should read 1885, a slip of James's pen.

⁷¹ Anesko, p. 37.

⁷² For example, links were temporarily severed in 1890 when James embarked on his dramatic interlude.

⁷³ Rayburn S. Moore, ed., *The Correspondence of Henry James and the House of Macmillan, 1887-1914: 'All the Links in the Chain'* (London: Macmillan, 1993), p. xxiv. Further references to this book are given after quotations in the text.

⁷⁴ Moore, p. 21.

⁷⁵ Anesko, p. 55.

⁷⁶ In comparison to the print run of 1500 for *Idylls of the King* by Tennyson, in 1880, Macmillan only risked publishing 200 copies of James's *Partial Portraits*.

⁷⁷ Edel, *The Middle Years*, p. 248.

⁷⁸ Salmon, p. 61.

⁷⁹ Anesko, p. 21.

⁸⁰ Leon Edel, *Henry James: The Treacherous Years, 1895-1901* (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1969), p. 66.

⁸¹ Jacobson, p. 82.

⁸² Margolis, p. 101.

⁸³ Salmon, p. 61.

⁸⁴ It is interesting that in *NGS* it is only Milvain, the epitome of the field of large-scale production, who realises the value of disinterestedness. He asks 'How can I get the eyes of men fixed upon me? The answer: By pretending I am quite independent of their gaze', *NGS*, p. 422.

⁸⁵ Taken from the Prefaces in Henry James, *Literary Criticism, French Writers, Other European Writers, The Prefaces to the New York Edition*, ed. by Leon Edel (New York: The Library of America, 1984), p. 1233-4.

⁸⁶ Henry James, 'The Next Time', in *The Figure in the Carpet and Other Stories*, ed. by Frank Kermode (London: Penguin, 1986), 305-535 (p. 308). Further references to this story are given after quotations in the text.

⁸⁷ Anne T. Margolis, *Henry James and the Problem of Audience: An International Act*, *Studies in Modern Literature*, no. 49 (Ann Arbor, MI.: UMI Research Press, 1985), p. 101.

⁸⁸ Salmon, p. 71.

⁸⁹ Katherine Leon Mix, *A Study in Yellow: The Yellow Book and its Contributors* (London: Constable, 1960), p. 35.

⁹⁰ Mix, p. 59.

⁹¹ Henry James, *Literary Criticism: French Writers, Other European Writers, The Prefaces to the New York Edition*, p. 1227.

⁹² Sullivan, p. 457-8. It has been argued that the book in *Dorian Gray* is J. K. Huysmans' *A Rebours*. See editor's note to p. 125, Oscar Wilde, *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, ed. by Isobel Murray (London: Oxford University Press, 1974).

⁹³ Philip Horne, 'Henry James and the Economy of the Short Story' in *Modernist Writers and the Market Place*, ed. by Ian Willison, Warwick Gould and Warren Chernaik (London: Macmillan, 1996), p. 13.

⁹⁴ Mix, p. 166.

⁹⁵ Mix, p. 274.

⁹⁶ Randal Johnson's introduction to *Field*, 1-25 (p. 8).

⁹⁷ Anesko, p. 143.

⁹⁸ Moore, p. 12. A letter to Macmillan on the 27 March 1878 requested a copy of the review of *French Poets and Novelists* which he had been unable to obtain.

⁹⁹ Frank Kermode's introduction to Henry James, *The Figure in the Carpet and Other Stories*, 7-30 (p. 25).

¹⁰⁰ Henry James, 'The Figure in the Carpet', in *The Figure in the Carpet and Other Stories*, 355-400 (p. 358). Further references to this story are given after quotations in the text. It was originally published in *Cosmopolis* and then in *The Embarrassments*.

¹⁰¹ This is a paraphrase of Margolis's observation that James's reputation 'rested, at least prior to the 90s, largely in the hands of critics for whom he had little respect', p. 76.

¹⁰² Horne, p. 6.

¹⁰³ Boege (2), p. 54.

CHAPTER FOUR

The Sub-Field of Large-Scale Production: J. M. Barrie, New Journalism and *Sentimental Tommy*

Assuming then that an author is justified in desiring immediate popularity, instead of being content with poverty and the unheard plaudits of posterity, another point presents itself. Ought he to limit himself to a mere desire for popularity, or ought he actually do something, or refrain from doing something, to the special end of obtaining popularity? Ought he to say: "I shall write exactly what and how I like, without any regard for the public; I shall consider nothing but my own individuality and powers; I shall be guided solely by my own personal conception of what the public ought to like"? Or ought he to say: "Let me examine this public, and let me see whether some compromise between us is not possible"?

Arnold Bennett¹

The 1890s was a time when the culture industry began to force 'together the spheres of high and low art, separated for thousands of years', to the detriment of both.² Accordingly, some participants in the field of literary production felt it necessary to make the new readers aware that there was a difference between the two. As *New Grub Street* suggests, a simple differentiation was made between art and journalism. Art was ideally destined towards an audience of producers in the sub-field of restricted production, while in opposition, journalism belonged clearly in the sub-field of large-scale production, functioning as a very popular form of

writing 'oriented towards the satisfaction of the demands of a wide audience' (*Rules*, p121). However, not all positions in journalism were as clear-cut as those which the fictional Milvain and the 'Complete Leader-Writer' would have held because, as discussed in the earlier chapters, the two extremes within the field - either total and cynical subordination to demand or absolute independence from the market and its exigencies - 'are never, in fact, attained' (*Rules*, p. 141-2). Peter McDonald expands on this by suggesting that between these two extremes, 'there are any number of positions which combine the two perspectives in various ways'.³ Through one such position held by J. M. Barrie, this chapter directs itself towards the problems experienced, and caused, by the appearance of a new kind of literary journalist, who while catering ostensibly for the masses produced work of symbolic value.

It is necessary initially to re-position Barrie within the cultural debate which surrounded the value of journalism in the 1890s. J. M. Barrie's work up to and including *The Little Minister* (1892) was reviewed in a comparative study between Barrie and Rudyard Kipling entitled 'The Journalist in Fiction', in the *Church Quarterly Review* (1893). While focussing primarily on Barrie, the reviewer does not ignore what he perceives to be limiting journalistic traits in the fiction of both writers. He highlights an 'inability or dislike to construct or conduct a long story, in itself a decided limitation of the narrative art' as 'the material characteristic which marks' their works, concluding that they are 'good for little but short flights'.⁴ For example, he notes that in *The Little Minister* the 'story seems to lose its way and wanders here and there confusedly' (p. 88). However, for the main part, the article is concerned with 'how far their journalistic training has helped them in the art of fiction' (p. 76). The reviewer wishes to demonstrate the powers rather than the limitations of journalism in order to suggest that 'journalism need not vulgarise' (p. 76).

The narrative deficiency, for example, in Barrie's longer works is considered as compensated for by his mastery of the short story, described as Barrie's 'natural mode of expression' (p. 77). H. G. Wells was later to recognise Barrie's talent in this particular genre, acknowledging that he had shown 'what could be done in a little space through the panes of his *Window in Thrums*'.⁵ It is this novel which the reviewer suggests illustrates the 'skilful device [by which] Barrie selected a form which, while it gave a loose but artistic unity to his work, enabled him to avoid his besetting difficulty in composition' (p. 83). Linked with his aptitude for sketches, the reviewer argues that producing work in the 1890s, when there appeared readers who were so 'scant of breath that they call Scott long-winded', had allowed Barrie to learn that the 'first lesson of a writer for the press [was] not to be tedious' (p. 77).

The article proposes that the journalist must do three things - advocate, observe and describe. A combination of the latter two qualities creates another positive attribute which Barrie and Kipling brought to their literature from their experience in journalism; 'excellence in realistic description' (p. 78). In terms of description Barrie is compared to Emile Zola, the French naturalist whose books had recently become available in Britain as cheap editions. The similarity is based on the 'progressive touches' in his work, whereby the reader 'notices the details, then forgets them; but his mind, by an unconscious process, makes up with them the total picture' (p. 80). This method allows for an uncompromising realism deemed 'natural enough in a journalist':

If a man has spent years in trying to reproduce with the crispest and most vivid touch attainable exactly what happened in the daylight of the world - and this is the method of the best journalism - he is likely to people the world of his own creation with singularly definite phantoms.

(p. 80)

The reviewer judges Barrie's brand of realism to be the most distinguishing and modern characteristic of his writing. His works come as a revelation 'showing us what we never saw before in what we have always had before our eyes' without degenerating into caricature (p. 81).

The article also points out that Barrie's talent should come as no surprise because with the 'great army of journalists now earning a livelihood by the practice of writing it was only to be expected that a writer of mark would appear' (p. 73).

This introduces the general problem created by popular journalists who showed talent in fiction writing, namely literary journalists, but also specifically introduces Barrie and his complex situation. Commenting briefly on Barrie's fledgling attempt at drama, *Walker, London*, the reviewer argues that it is a 'clever comedy with which Mr. Barrie won honour (and no doubt money) in a fresh field which may probably engage much of his future energies' (p. 75). This prophetic statement epitomises the difficulty facing Barrie and his critics in the 1890s. His works were of both symbolic and monetary value so in which sub-field should he be placed?

To deter further classification, like Whelpdale, his position kept changing.

Throughout his lifetime he was a journalist, a critic, a novelist, a playwright, a director, President of the Society of Authors and finally knighted. How could he be categorised to the satisfaction of the critics, the public and Barrie, himself?

The problem would not have been so pronounced had everyone shared the opinions of the *Church Quarterly* writer concerning the inter-relationship between art and journalism. His positive attitude towards journalism, however, was not typical. That journalism and art could be treated as equal was rare, but the suggestion that journalism could actively help in the creation of art was practically non-existent. The reviewer admired Barrie's ability to discover 'not only what interests himself but what interests everyone' (p. 79), but it was this aspect which caused debate. Could a writer consider or, worse, make concessions to his audience and still be called an artist?

The most conventional opinion on these related pursuits is demonstrated by Aline Gorren in 'The Ethics of Modern Journalism' which appeared in *Scribner's Magazine* in 1896, the same year that the novel being serialised in the American periodical was *Sentimental Tommy* (ST) by Barrie. Gorren uses her article to comment on a speech made by the French critic Ferdinand Brunetière concerning modern journalism. Gorren argues that it is a time when to 'take any but the shortest and most immediate views of this topic, that is of such incalculable importance to every side and aspect of modern life, appears to be one of the things that it is tacitly understood must not be done'.⁶ As the Fourth Estate the press remains in power but untested by searching criticism and, therefore, she welcomes Brunetière's interest in the subject. Brunetière had presented the new journalism as just another 'literary form or style, best voicing the greatest number of persons at that period', which 'bursts forth almost simultaneously everywhere; in due course wanes and presently suffers a transformation into another style, serving in turn the needs of the new hours' (XIX, p. 507). By accepting this argument Gorren and Brunetière perceive that the 'indiscriminate and unintelligent tone of modern journalism is something that [they] cannot escape from, but must endure' (XIX, p. 507).

The conclusion which Brunetière reached was that 'literature and journalism were fundamentally incompatible conceptions' (XIX, p. 507). Gorren proceeds to investigate the differences between American and French journalism, a comparison considered fruitful because it presented the two extremes. The variance between them is based on the degree to which each quenches the 'modern thirst for personalities' and 'serves the modern spirit of publicity' (XIX, p. 508). If there is any literature in journalism, Gorren thinks it can be found in French journalism, while it is the American editor who has to 'reckon with the socially half-cultivated', a description echoing Whelpdale's 'quarter-educated'. Therefore, Gorren suggests that this address should be of the greatest interest in America

because she believes that it is in America, if anywhere, that 'the divorce between journalism and the literary spirit is complete' (XIX, p. 507).

Gorren's article concentrates on the lack of literary journalism, arguing that a newspaper 'is literary not alone by what it contains, but by what it excludes' (XIX, p. 508). Equally, the inclusion of a piece of literature in a newspaper does not necessarily make it literary. In this respect she mentions the type of work which Barrie was publishing simultaneously, the serial story:

Insistence has been placed on the large number of serial and short stories of literary sketches of one kind and another, of which the Sunday editions of the great newspapers, in particular make so prominent a feature. So much is there of this matter, indeed, that many intelligent and serious journalists have not been slow to express a fear that our newspapers were occupying themselves too extensively with literature, to the consequent curtailment of their news-space.

(XIX, p. 508)

This highlights two points. First, within the field of journalism itself a hierarchy was developing; a growing distinction was forming between its high and low forms. Second, it shows that contempt was reciprocal. As a result, not all journalists felt that literature was better than journalism, rather they enjoyed being as good as they could be within their own field.

As well as describing the ways in which a newspaper is not 'literary', Gorren considers why literature cannot be written by a journalist. She describes the newspaper writer:

ordinarily accounted clever by his newspaper is not he who sees things in their relations, in their interdependence, in their place in the general scheme, and who therefore sees them veraciously, and is likely to have acquired an artistic conscience that makes it impossible for him to present them otherwise.

(XIX, p. 511)

A person who excels at journalism, apparently, does not have the pre-requisite for writing literature, an artistic conscience. Furthermore, Gorren is concerned with the detrimental influence of journalism on art. She argues that 'good writing presupposes hesitancies and distinctions that would hamper the stirring reporter in the discharge of his duties', implicitly stripping the journalist of another two virtues commonly thought to be found in an artist.

It was within this debate concerning the values of journalism and art that Barrie was functioning and his work reflects this conflict. His position is even more complex because not only did he begin his literary career as a very successful journalist but he committed aesthetic suicide by writing popular novels and later creating sell-out plays. This chapter seeks to investigate the problems experienced by a writer within the field of large-scale production, who indeed does not scorn popularity, but does not wish to be denied symbolic value upon those grounds. Some of Barrie's journalistic and critical work is used reveal his position with regards to popular aesthetic debate. A new reading of *Sentimental Tommy* serialised in *Scribner's Magazine* then argues that the novel is a product of Barrie's participation within the conflicts of the field.

*But Barrie is a beauty [. . .] eh? Stuff in that young man;
but he must see and not be too funny. Genius in him, but
there's a journalist at his elbow - there's the risk.*

Robert Louis Stevenson⁷

New Journalism's entry into the field of literary production at the end of the nineteenth century did little to enhance the reputation of journalism. Barrie's journalistic career, however, had been the launch pad for his literary one. He began work on the *Nottingham Journal* in 1883, where he progressed to the post of leader-writer.⁸ Two years later he moved to London and continued his freelance work, contributing criticism and general observations to, amongst others, Frederick

Greenwood at the *St. James's Gazette*. It was November 1884, in this publication, that the first sketch about Thrums appeared under Barrie's pseudonym, Gavin Ogilvy. Although Barrie felt he had exhausted the subject in that one article, at Greenwood's suggestion, many others were written and accepted.⁹ These short snippets of Scottish life were to be compiled, rewritten and republished in book form as *Auld Licht Idylls* (1888) and *A Window in Thrums* (1889) under Barrie's real name. They were collected predominantly from the *St. James's Gazette*, *The British Weekly* and the *Scots Observer*.¹⁰

Throughout his early literary career, Barrie was attempting to reconcile art and journalism, producers and consumers. Journalism was his first step into the field of literary production and the only way in which he could initially earn a living, having no other means of support. Just because what he produced was journalism, and it was popular, however, did not mean it was necessarily devoid of symbolic value. Barrie wanted others to recognise, like Leslie Stephen had, that 'at rare intervals, a real bit of artistic workmanship gets imbedded amidst ephemeral matter'.¹¹ It was convincing those in the positions of consecration that presented the problem. Barrie realised that little could be gained by avoiding the new powers of the press and he preferred to manipulate them than be buried by them.

Barrie was a very successful and popular writer from the 1890s onwards. Gissing wrote in 1891 that Barrie was one of 'three enormous reputations [. . .] made in England in the past year or so'.¹² Earlier, in 1890, he had achieved celebrity status in *Punch* when he was included in their series of parodies on popular novelists entitled 'Mr. Punch's Prize Novels'. Beside such writers as Meredith, Ward and Kipling, Barrie's style of writing was lampooned as 'Thrums on the Auld String' by J. Muir Kirrie.¹³ Although, could this indicate that he was too popular? Stevenson certainly seems to be castigating him for being too aware of his public, although unlike Milvain and others, he does not rule out the possibility of a journalist also having 'genius'. Would Barrie forever remain in the

field of large-scale production and thus never gain the respect available only in the field of restricted production? Importantly, what does Barrie's writing reveal about the position in which he found himself?

Although Barrie had valued his journalistic experience as a stepping stone towards fiction writing, or a way of playing the field, he did not stand for the democratisation of the literary field. Barrie made the distinction, as both the writers in *Scribner's* and *The Church Quarterly* had, between the mediocre new journalism and 'serious' or 'better' journalism. In the contemporary climate in which journalism was negatively viewed it is natural that Barrie should address the subject. He was being defined as a journalist or popular novelist in the 1890s and he had to find a way to indicate his feelings about this categorisation. Meynell explains that he had already rejected the most obvious methods of answering his critics:

Nor did his letter-writing include letters to the papers - that temptation of authors when reviewers trip up. Barrie is accused for instance of using, as Scotch, a word that is not Scotch: 'I wrote a brief letter to that paper,' he had recorded, 'saying that this word was not only good Scotch but was in frequent use in the Waverley novels [. . .]. I then put the letter in my desk and went exultantly to bed. But there was something wrong and I could not sleep, and somewhere in the early hours I made up my mind to tear up that letter and never in my life to answer criticism.'¹⁴

Equally, he was not about to take advantage of the new celebrity status given to authors by the press. He wrote to Arthur Quiller-Couch in January 1894 revealing his thoughts upon the new 'age of interviewing'.

Never shall man nor maid interview me. Then Harold Frederic wanted to do a joint-author talk with me, a thing in which author (a) says 'When did you first feel genius springing up within you?' and author (b) (the owl) gravely tells him, and then (a) tells (b) which he considers his master-piece, etc., etc. I needn't tell you my answer to that.¹⁵

Therefore, it is only in his fiction that any form of retaliation, on Barrie's part, will be found. His position regarding New Journalism and an implicit definition of his own position within the field is shown in a short article entitled 'Ndintpile Pont' published in *The Bookman* (1892). The introduction to the article explains that 'Mr. Barrie was for years a most industrious journalist, and some of his best work is buried - not hopelessly - in newspaper files'.¹⁶

'Ndintpile Pont' begins by describing the situation in which the narrator had found himself the previous week:

'What would you say,' wrote a certain editor to me last Friday, 'to doing next a paper on Ndintpile Pont?' I like the suggestion, but can't make out what Ndintpile Pont is. This rather handicaps me, especially as I have a presentiment that it is not Ndintpile Pont at all. It looks like Ndintpile Pont. The editor in question's handwriting appears very easy if you hold it a little bit away, but, like the multiplication table, it is not so simple as it looks. The annoying thing is that he has written Ndintpile Pont with one dash of the pen, as if it were so well known that I could not possibly go wrong with it. Thus I have felt reluctant to write and ask him whether it really is Ndintpile Pont. I don't want him to think that I am not well up in the topics of the day.¹⁷

This satiric article sees Barrie present the dilemma of a journalist required to write a column on a subject about which he knows nothing. In an attempt to find out more the journalist asks his friends for suggestions. However, rather than simply asking them what they think the words 'Ndintpile Pont' actually represent, he shows them the letter with 'affected carelessness, and say[s], "By the way what do you think of that for the subject of an article?" '. The rest of the piece presents the alternative ideas proffered.

The first proposal is that it is 'Henderson's Book' which the journalist admits it could be because on re-examination he finds that, ' "Pont" might be "Book," and as for "Ndintpile," it might be anything'. Although, *if* that is what it says then the question still remains, 'Who is Henderson, and where is his book?' On the other hand, it could be a 'striking pseudonym' assumed by some lady writer, in which

case he could write an article about her, remarking that it would be unnecessary to tell 'the intelligent reader' her real name. The ideas become progressively more ludicrous, especially after the journalist confesses to a few close friends that he thinks that the editor has contrived to puzzle him. In the light of this information they all agree on one point, 'namely, that whatever it is it is certainly not Ndintpile Pont'.¹⁸ Finally, the writer admits defeat and informs the editor that he will not be able to write an article this month because he 'can't make out the subject'.

This is a typically two-sided piece of work by Barrie, allowing him to use journalism to present his views, while at the same time entertaining the reader. On the superficial level it is a very amusing, anecdotal sketch about an unspecified topic which pleasantly fills the space between two other articles. In fact it is a perfect example of New Journalism which would have satisfied the new audience; short and entertaining. Hugh Walpole in his preface to *McConnachie and J. M. B.* laments the fact that so many people, when reading Barrie, take him only on this first, surface level, that is the level produced for consumers. He continues that, 'the majority of us have no time, as regards other people, for more than surfaces - and so Barrie tricked nine-tenths of us, and knew well that he was tricking us'.¹⁹ Functioning on this deeper level 'Ndintpile Pont' shows Barrie attacking the new type of journalism, those who produce it and the society which has perpetuated its popularity. It is a scathing attack on the extreme positions found in the sub-field of large-scale production at that time.

Barrie first launches an attack on feigned intelligence, directing his criticism towards readers as well as journalists. The whole situation arises because of the journalist's wish to appear 'well up on the topics of the day', a guise which prevents him from immediately approaching his editor for clarification. He realises that he can exploit a similar vanity in his readers. He need not tell the reader who Ndintpile Pont is because, 'it always flatters a reader to call him intelligent, and take for granted that he knows what he does not know'. It was this desire to appear

intelligent, rather than admit ignorance, that was blamed for the acceptance of decadence, after decadence has been safely dismissed with the trial of Oscar Wilde in 1895. The argument was that no-one had actually liked the high art of Wilde and the decadents, but had merely pretended to in order to appear more intelligent. After Wilde's imprisonment they did not need to pretend anymore. John Stokes quotes Max Beerbohm as an advocate of this idea,

The tragedy and ruin of the most distinguished of the aesthetes has given the public its cue. 'Art,' it cries, 'is all wickedness.' It dives into the pages of the genial Nordau. 'Art,' it cries, 'is all madness. We were quite right after all' [. . .]. Now this, it *seems to me*, is the extent of the revolution - that the public need pretend no more.²⁰

Barrie is calling attention to these pretensions and criticising them as such. The new readership, accordingly, should not be pandered to but further educated so that their intelligence is more than merely pretence.

More specifically, Barrie proceeds to condemn the ethics of certain journalists. The journalist realises that to blindly endorse Ndintpile Pont as a great soap 'sounds rather like treason'. After consideration *this* journalist is not willing to commit such treachery against his profession, but the implication is that there are others who would. There are journalists, who, like the 'ideal leader-writer', do not consider what they write or the consequences, but simply write. The topics dealt with by these new journalists do not escape Barrie's censure either. Barrie creates a writer who does not immediately reject his editor's suggestion of writing a paper on Ndintpile Pont, but indeed professes to 'like the suggestion', despite the fact that he has no idea what it means. Journalists are again being accused of writing on topics on which they have no authority, which they can do because the authority they *do* have remains unchallenged by the new readership. The new reading public did not demand much from its press, although it is unclear whether this public was the 'creator or the creation of market demand'.²¹ The eventual refusal of Barrie's

fictional journalist to write on an entirely undefined topic makes an article out of exactly that; an undefined topic. Articles, like this, which meant 'the reverse of what they seemed to say', are the very type which had worried Greenwood earlier in Barrie's career.²²

Returning to Walpole's analysis of Barrie's work, Barrie did not only mean what he said, but 'meant a great deal more than he said'.²³ The apparent topic of 'Ndintpile Pont' is non-existent, fantastic and fatuous. However, the article works on two levels and, therefore, placed just below the surface is a satire on contemporary readers and journalistic practise. New Journalism does not demand a 'point', but Barrie makes many. Its criticism is directed at people, like the fictional Milvain, who simply fall into journalism and take positions at the extremities of the field of large-scale production. 'Blowitz', the London editor, shared this awareness of the dangers of the random democratisation of the literary profession. In his article 'Journalism as a Profession' in *The Contemporary Review* (1893), he promotes the idea of a college for journalists as a pre-requisite, in an attempt to stop any more 'chance' journalists. If this does not happen he warns that 'the only alternative is ruin; and this ruin will be mingled with the universal ruin which it will have caused'.²⁴ Barrie was keen to separate the ethos of the New Journalist from his own brand of journalism and through his work, and his existence in the field, he exemplifies the new breed of literary journalist.

Stevenson saw Barrie's journalistic talent as a danger to his literary work and critics of Barrie's fiction have generally accepted this view; to continue to write for the press was to compromise one's art. Peter Keating is one of the kinder critics, placing Barrie alongside Besant and Payn. He considers this compromise 'as a policy decision, taken as either a way of buying time to write more serious fiction or as a path to a more comfortable livelihood'.²⁵ Harry M. Geduld, however, is more chastening:

[Barrie's] shortcomings as a novelist - and the basis for today's general neglect of his fiction - are, however directly traceable to his journalistic concessions to the tastes of the reading public.²⁶

It is not often recognised that Barrie's journalistic background, rather than devaluing his later work, contributed something to it. It is not inconceivable that, in agreement with the *Church Quarterly*, it did in fact do both.

Barrie, for one, found his experience in journalism useful. Not only did it pay for his meals and bring him into the public domain, but it furnished him with ideas which he later developed and rewrote for reappearance in his novels and plays. The *Church Quarterly* reviewer noticed that out of *When a Man's Single*, Barrie's early novel about the experiences of a young journalist, arose the suggestion for *Walker London* (p. 75), while Geduld remarks that *Auld Licht Idylls* is 'seminal to all of the subsequent Thrums stories'.²⁷ Indeed, the sketches in both *Auld Licht Idylls* and *A Window in Thrums* contain many ideas present in *Sentimental Tommy* and *Tommy and Grizel*. In *A Window in Thrums*, there is 'The Tale of the Glove' which is the inspiration for Grizel's glove, the catalyst in *Tommy and Grizel*, and there are the beginnings of 'finding a wy'. In 'A Humorist on his Calling' it is Tammas's 'gift of words' which brings T'nowhead to say 'if I was bidden to put Tammas's gift in a word [. . .] I would say 'at he had a wy. That's what I would say'.²⁸ Seven years later in *ST* Barrie was allowing a young boy to find this 'wy' again.

'Ndintpile Pont' illuminated some of Barrie's attitudes towards journalism, while the next article to be considered highlights his thoughts on the legitimacy of contemporary, defining voices. His opinions on the current vogue for discussing and theorising about art, more than creating it, are transmitted through 'Brought Back from Elysium'. The undercurrent of this sketch is that art had become laboured and artificial by the intense focus and debate surrounding it in the 1890s. While Barrie may have agreed with the new emphasis on literature as art, he was

against the self-conscious artist it seemed to produce. It is those in extreme positions in the sub-field of restricted production that are under attack in this fictional sketch.

'Brought Back From Elysium' appeared in *The Contemporary Review* in 1890. It is written as a play, where five novelists of the day call up the ghosts of past masters to discuss modern theories of art. The modern characters are a Realist, a Romancist, a Stylist, an American Analyst and an Elsmerian, who shares the latitudinarianism present in Mrs Humphry Ward's *Robert Elsmere*. They meet the ghosts of Scott, Fielding, Smollett, Dickens and Thackeray in a club for 'high thinking' in Piccadilly, reflecting the current trend for London literary clubs.²⁹

Although the Elsmerian maintains that they all disapprove of each other's methods and despise each other, Barrie ensures they share at least one characteristic. The stage direction at the beginning finds the '*four eminent novelists of the day regarding each other self-consciously*', a trait echoed in the American Analyst when he joins them, '*(looking around him self-consciously)*'.³⁰ The self-consciousness of the modern novelists is shown to contrast with the older writers. The Romancist questions whether Scott had ever defined romance, stating that 'no-one had the right to be a Romancist unconsciously'. Scott lamely admits to the ironically naïve notion that he 'thought perhaps [his] books might be allowed to speak for [him]' (p. 851). The Elsmerian has to tell the ghosts that 'fiction has become an art' (p. 848), and at points in the play each living writer reveals what they believe to be the secret of that art. The Elsmerian maintains that, 'religious doubt is the only subject for the novelist nowadays' (p. 850); the Stylist that there can be no art in a style which comes naturally; and the American that the 'story in a novel is of as little importance as the stone in a cherry' (p. 849). The final analogy is particularly effective because the seed of a fruit is obviously its source of reproduction and in reality of most importance because neglect of the seed would end in the extinction of the species. In Barrie's opinion, therefore, if the story is

continually overlooked in deference to aesthetic debate, literature will be destroyed.

The ghosts admit that they did not self-consciously try to write a work of art within the confines of a literary style but merely wished to tell a story. It is the Romancist who enlightens them to the fact that since 'fiction is an art, the work of its followers consists less in writing mere stories [. . .] than in classifying ourselves and [. . .] classifying you' (p. 848). That this is limiting to art is shown by the Stylist. The Stylist is the epitome of someone unable to work because of his absorption in literary theories. When he enters, the Realist asks if he heard something and he starts to reply, '- I - the - (*pauses to reflect on the best way of saying it was only the clock*)', but ends up saying nothing more (p. 846). His literary output reflects a similar situation because the one book he has written he withdrew from circulation because he is 'such a stylist that [he] dare not write anything' (p. 849). Scott compares this to his own experience of having written two novels in four months and is informed that he has paid the penalty because his books are still popular. The following exchange reveals a growing awareness of the reversed economy functioning in the sub-field of restricted production:

Dickens: But is not popularity nowadays a sign of merit?
 Stylist: To be popular is to be damned
 Sir Walter: I can see from what you tell me that I was only a child. I thought little about how novels should be written. I only tried to write them, and as for style, I am afraid I merely used the words that came most readily. (*Stylist groans.*) I had such an interest in my characters (*American groans*), such a love for them (*Realist groans*), that they were like living beings to me. Action seemed to come naturally to them, and all I had to do was to run after them with my pen.
 Romancist: In the dark days you had not a cheap press, nor scores of magazines and reviews. Ah, we have many opportunities that were denied you.

(p. 849)

These were prevalent ideas when Barrie was writing. To be popular or thought a mere story-teller was not something of which to feel proud and the naïveté of the older novelists is scorned.

Each 'past master' is analysed by the modern theorists and each of their defences is met with contempt. The questioning of these novelists' art is something which Barrie feels is unnecessary and thus the target of his satire. Furthermore, he implies that eternal discussion of these conflicting theories can be damaging to the development of art. Fielding remarks, 'does it make a man a better novelist to know that other novelists pursue the wrong methods? You seem to despise each other cordially, while Smollett and I [. . .] can enjoy Sir Walter' (p. 850). Finally, the ghosts are asked if they have any advice to offer and Thackeray is the mouthpiece for Barrie's own recommendation to the new self-conscious artist:

if you thought and wrote less about your styles and methods
and the aim of fiction, and, in short forgot yourselves now
and again in your stories, you might get on better with your
work.

(p. 854)

Thus, as Leonee Ormond suggests, this piece argues that 'in turning fiction into a "fine art", the writers of the late nineteenth century had become obsessed with technique, and impoverished the narrative technique of the novel'.³¹ Barrie did not resent the discussion of art by those who were artists. What he was campaigning against was the idea of an hierarchy of art imposed by those who talked more than they created, people who in his opinion were not legitimate voices. He wrote in 1910 of an experience in the Savile Club:

They were as usual all discussing style. Everyone had proposed ideas on style except Hardy, who said something childish about it. I thought (not with displeasure) "The only one among you who has a style is the only one who knows nothing about it."³²

'Ndintpile Pont' illustrates that Barrie wanted to be considered apart from the New Journalists with their lack of principles and talent, and 'Brought Back from Elysium' shows that he did not like the current trend which required writers to be defined either. He was working somewhere between the two extreme positions consistently aware of the aesthetic arguments which sought to categorise his writing. He wrote to Arthur Quiller-Couch that his review of *ST* had 'found out some things about me and about the book that I thought were only known to myself'.³³ Quiller-Couch had the authority to consecrate Barrie's work on three grounds. One, he was a successful novelist himself. Two, he was a graduate of the University of Oxford, had lectured there for a year before moving to London to launch his literary career, and was later to become the second Professor of English Literature at Cambridge. The last authority on which Quiller-Couch consecration rests, however, is perhaps the most valuable; Barrie valued his opinion. He wrote that he would rather please him than any man he knew, implying that Quiller-Couch was one of the producers for whom Barrie was producing.³⁴ For the purposes of this chapter, it is reassuring to discover that Quiller-Couch considers *ST* to be 'a study of what we call the "artistic temperament" [. . .] the portrait of a boy all unconsciously cursed [. . .] with a genius for art.'³⁵

Barrie, *Scribner's* and the Critics

Throughout *Sentimental Tommy* Barrie makes references to the growing importance of journalism, recalling many of the contemporary issues surrounding it. It is revealed that the one copy of *The Mentor* which is delivered to Thrums is read by every household and that Miss Ailie had written to the editor asking up until what age he thought a needy gentlewoman had the right to teach. While Miss Ailie does not take his advice, the question reflects the position of increasing responsibility which editors held, and indicates the expanding influence of the new

press upon everyday life. Similarly, the article entitled 'The Boy Pirate' in *Mamma's Boy* is mentioned because it performs the seemingly impossible task of turning the young Tommy from a valiant Jacobite, under the influence of Scott's *Waverley*, into a staunch monarchist merely by warning of boys 'who had been undone by pernicious fiction'.³⁶

Barrie proceeds to implicitly criticise New Journalism and its readership by presenting Ivie McLean's as 'one of the notable few who can think about one thing for at least five consecutive minutes' (*ST*, p. 290). He is not one of the growing number of readers whom Whelpdale wished to attract and, as such, he is respected. Barrie saw that New Journalism was encouraging its intended readership not to think, nor question, but merely accept and be entertained. He functioned at a time when many authors wished 'to distinguish all literature worthy of the name from the debased reading matter being produced for mass entertainment'.³⁷ Yet, it was against this climate that he still decided to publish *Sentimental Tommy* serially in *Scribner's Magazine*.

Barrie wanted his views on art to be heard, not only through his criticism but in his fiction writing, and for a book on the artist and his art it is apt that Barrie chose *Scribner's Magazine* for *ST*'s debut. *Scribner's Magazine* was a mixture of fiction, fact, and opinion which embraced the ideas that Barrie hoped to convey in his serial. Furthermore, although a popular miscellany publication, its editor recognised and appreciated work of symbolic value. The founder of Charles Scribner's Sons publishing house, Charles Scribner, had written of his desire 'to issue a magazine that is handsomely illustrated, beautifully printed, and that shall have as contributors the best authors of the day. I should like to make it different from any now published and to reach also other classes of readers'.³⁸ As a result of these aims, the instalments of Barrie's novel appear alongside fiction in the form of poems, plays, and short stories, popular articles about artists and factual articles on

scientific discoveries, the length and depth of which denote a periodical attempting a 'better' type of journalism.

The relationship between the serial story and its mother magazine is a complicated one, allowing for various types of consecration to occur. First, there is the consecration and supplementation provided by illustrations, an addition increasing the miscellany nature of periodicals. Photographs, paintings and pictures found themselves adorning interviews, reviews and fiction, popularised by the development of photography, cheaper methods of printing and the interest in art in the 1890s. To illustrate a piece of fiction was not a new idea. Dickens, for example, had used pictures to his advantage earlier in the century, but the illustration began to be given more attention with the arrival on the scene of Aubrey Beardsley. The illustrations of the first art editor of the *Yellow Book*, as Holbrook Jackson suggests, 'overpower the text - not because they are greater but because they are inappropriate, sometimes even impertinent'.³⁹ Dedicated to visual stimulation, *Scribner's* was conspicuously filled with paintings, bookbindings and photographs from the famous to the unknown and it follows, therefore, that pictures should accompany Barrie's serial novel, in this instance, drawn by William Hatherell.

It is difficult to ascertain whether Barrie actually instructed Hatherell which parts to illustrate, or left the decision to the artist's discretion. MacKail reveals that Barrie was in detailed correspondence with Bernard Partridge about his illustrations for *Tommy and Grizel*, but for *ST* there is ambiguity. What can be said with a degree of certainty is that Barrie was initially happy with them. In a letter to Edward Livermore Burlingame, the editor of *Scribner's*, he wrote 'I thoroughly like the illustrations to the first instalment of "Tommy", and hope that the others will be as good'.⁴⁰ The unlikelihood of anything appearing in the serial without Barrie's express agreement is further validated by the fact that Charles Scribner

was simultaneously helping Barrie to combat piracy and abortions of his work in America.

The serial is fronted by a photograph taken by F. Hollyer of Barrie leaning over his desk. The first and second instalments are unique because the former contains two illustrations, the latter none, while the remaining parts all have one. These pictures are not in the vein of either Boz or Beardsley; they do not add an extra dimension to, nor detract from, the story. In addition, they are more realistic than the work of the other illustrators. What they do achieve, though, is a form of consecration because their very appearance draws attention to specific parts of the novel. This is made especially clear as most of the pictures for *ST* appear on pages preceding the text to which they refer and in this way the reader is forced to give greater importance to the illustrated incidents than he may naturally have done.

For example, the first illustration for *ST* in *Scribner's* shows Tommy as a small boy with Bob and the caption 'Bob fell in love with him on the spot and chucked him under the chin' (*Fig. 2*).⁴¹ Immediately Bob is given an importance which her character does not achieve through the seven paragraphs devoted to her in the typescript. The passage, beginning 'Shovel had never heard of such a street' and ending 'that is how Tommy got his trousers' (*ST*, p. 47-8) is short and easily overlooked, but the picture persuades the reader to re-read it, and the scene deserves such reconsideration. Bob is a dancing girl and, while she is the professional actress, Tommy is the amateur. Barrie depicts the situation from a child's point of view by describing Tommy's confusion over her gender:

Bob was his favourite among the dancing girls, and she
- or should it be he? The odd thing about these girls was that a
number of them were really boys - or at least were boys
at Christmas-time, which seemed to Tommy stranger than
if they had been boys all the year round.

(*ST*, p. 47)



Drawn by William Hatherell.

Bob fell in love with him on the spot and chucked him under the chin.—Page 30.

Figure 2: 'Bob fell in love with him on the spot and chucked him under the chin': Illustration from the serialisation of *Sentimental Tommy*, taken from *Scribner's Magazine*, 19 (1896), [p.15].

Tommy knows that he has seen Bob as both a girl and a boy, but his limited knowledge of plays and pantomimes prevents him from coming to the real truth; Bob is a girl who frequently assumed male rôles. Accepting the truth as it appears to be, Tommy is experiencing the childhood problem of reconciling fact and fiction.

Barrie seems to be also tackling the subject of androgyny, a topic already broached when the novel's opening sentence commented upon Tommy's 'sexless garments' (*ST*, p. 1). It is only when he meets Bob, who donates an old blue suit of her own, that Tommy finally gets trousers, an incident which indicates a shift in Tommy's life. He has passed from the innocent age of childhood when to be a girl or a boy is irrelevant and it is fitting that the precipitator of this change has herself chosen the only career which still allows her to personify both genders. Barrie presented this at a time when the subject of gender was undergoing much questioning. The arrival on the scene in the 1890s of the New Feminist and Woman movements which were glibly banded together with the effeminate appearance of the decadents, were raising questions about accepted Victorian sexuality. Masculinity was being touted as the antithesis to femininity and this is reflected in some of the writings of the time. In this dichotomy Barrie seems to be siding more with Wilde and his dandyism than Rider Haggard and his 'male' adventure stories. In no way could this experimenting with sexuality be seen as consistent with seeking audience approval, in fact, if it were noticed at all, it could only jeopardise Barrie's popular appeal.

Ruth Robbins considers the question that was on the minds of many male writers in the 1890s; 'How does a man write in such a way as to ensure that his audience is in no doubt about his manliness?'.⁴² Her conclusions are that a masculine narrative is concerned with plain language, while an effeminate narrative would be more descriptive and phatic. In the article in the *Church Quarterly Review* Kipling and Barrie were seen to stand at opposite ends of this

debate. While Kipling's 'realism' is castigated for concentrating on unpleasant things, Barrie is applauded for having learnt, 'to combine [. . .] a woman's observation with a man's' (p. 79). He is commended for demonstrating not only 'something feminine in the minuteness of observation' but also an 'essentially masculine [. . .] delight' in the cunning of women (p. 84). Moreover, such a combination of female and male experience is presented as the basis for the best type of literature. Barrie, three years later, still seemed to advocate that masculine and feminine were qualities to be valued and accepted in everyone and that those who can function within both are apt to make the better artists.

The second form of consecration derived specifically from serial publication emanates from the selection of the magazine. Bourdieu explains why this decision is crucial:

Choosing the right place for publication, the right publisher, journal, gallery or magazine is vitally important because for each author, each form of production and product, there is a corresponding *natural site* in the field of production, and producers or products that are not in their right place are more or less bound to fail.

(Field, p. 95)

As a result of each having chosen the other there is an assumed reciprocal praise between *Scribner's* and Barrie. *ST* was encased within contemporary opinions on art and journalism, some which contradicted Barrie's views and others which vindicated them. The magazine, for example, echoes Barrie's position in 'Brought Back from Elysium' when it judges new writers as belonging to 'a generation more interested in questions about life than in living' (XX, p. 387), or in questioning art than in producing it. The overlapping of aesthetic debates between the magazine and the serial and the possible consequent confusion of the two meant that Barrie, and other serial novelists, had to be doubly careful about which magazine they

submitted their work to. For Barrie, *Scribner's* was a success, to such an extent that three years later it hosted the first appearance of *Tommy and Grizel* (1899).⁴³

Charles Scribner kept personal ties with his contributing authors, many of whom were British: Stevenson, Kipling, Galsworthy and Meredith as well as Barrie. However, unlike other editors, he did not ignore home grown talent. On the contrary, he allowed the pages of his periodical to highlight the fact that American magazine editors, at that time, were 'constantly accused of running after names and buying manuscripts from British writers to the disregard of the gifts and industry and methods of our own narration' (XIX, p. 781). Not only did *Scribner's* have a list of American authors, including Wharton, James, and later Hemingway, but Charles Scribner was appalled by the system of 'bidding' for authors that was to prevail at the turn of the century.⁴⁴ All this added to the reputation of the house seeking to make 'the Scribner imprint [. . .] a kind of blue ribbon which a host of distinguished authors, native and foreign', would be 'glad to wear'.⁴⁵

Each issue of *Scribner's* ended with articles entitled 'The Point of View' and 'The Field of Art'. The first considered literature and novelists, the second, the world of painting and sculpture. These regular aesthetic articles existed beside more detailed and individual contributions about art and literature including 'H. C. Brunner', 'Portraits of W. M. Turner' and 'Vailima Table-Talk'. The last article reveals the third way in which the magazine consecrated Barrie.

'Vailima Table-Talk' shows that Barrie held the position not only of a contributor within the magazine, but also of subject for discussion in the articles. Based on reminiscences about Stevenson, recollected by his step-daughter, Isobel Strong, it appeared in May and June 1896. One anecdote described Stevenson's experience in a Sydney bookshop when a clerk had approached him with 'great respect and recognition in his eye. "What have you been getting, Mr. Stevenson?" he asked. "We have all the best authors - Meredith, Barrie, Anstey"' (XIX, p. 539). The episode ended sourly when the clerk was unimpressed by Stevenson's choice

of popular fiction, but demonstrates how far Barrie's reputation had travelled by 1896.

This was not the first, nor the last, mention of Barrie outwith his position as author in the magazine. The serial had been running for four months when the editor in his 'Point of View' considers the recent growth of interest in children's literature, that is, literature about, rather than for children. This 'new child literature', associated with Kipling's *Jungle Book* and Stevenson's *A Child's Garden of Verses*, shows children as they are, rather than with the false touches that the editor feels Dickens had given his young characters in *Great Expectations* and *David Copperfield*. He argues for an emergent, golden period for the child in literature and 'unless the opening chapters of Mr Barrie's "Sentimental Tommy" are deceptive, he is about to add another to the books that prove my thesis' (XIX, p. 519-20). Therefore, Barrie has again moved position from contributor, to character, to the focus of critical debate.

The new branch of children's literature was a feature of the 1890s and one of the movements with which Barrie can be affiliated. Childhood began to be seen 'less as a distinctive transitory stage to adulthood than as a superior state of innocence which will be left behind only grudgingly'.⁴⁶ Peter Keating uses *Peter Pan* (1904) as the ultimate example of this type of work, but *Sentimental Tommy* can be read as the author's earlier attempt. Tommy's childhood is symbolically linked with the subconscious attributes of an artist, which can be ruined by adulthood in the way that art can be ruined by self-consciousness. The literary criticism offered by *Scribner's* is unique because it is practically guaranteed that it will be read by those reading the serial and, thus, it can influence the readers directly. Its influence is further empowered by the fact that no-one had finished reading it yet. The more formal reviews waited until the serialisation of *ST* was completed before adding their voices of consecration.

Blackwood's Magazine waited until December 1896 to review the portrayal of Tommy in 'The New Boy in Fiction'. It reiterates *Scribner's* earlier assertion that with Tommy, Barrie entered a hitherto neglected area for literary study; the workings of a young boy's mind. There were ample texts concerning either the adventures typical of the young, or the 'composite psychology' of a man, but it argues that Barrie had produced something different. For the excursion into boyhood in *ST* is judged to be 'something new in fiction. Here the boy is not the wooden counter of some romantic game [. . .] but a creature of fermenting mind, companioning his own emotions'.⁴⁷

The Academy maintains that there are 'few books in any year as good as *Sentimental Tommy*', describing it as 'a series of short stories - always connected with Tommy, but not always connected with each other [. . .]. Life goes by him in episodes'.⁴⁸ The reviewer realises that :

Mr Barrie's new book has practically no plot [. . .]. We have laughed, we have wept [. . .], we have been captured at the beginning and held to the end; but we come to make a sketch of the plot for the purposes of review, and it suddenly flashes on us that there is no plot, and can that be right?⁴⁹

There are indeed so many plots that it is hard to remember them all, leaving the impression that a story has been told but not being clear of the story itself.⁵⁰ The question of narrative and plot in *Sentimental Tommy* deserves consideration because the traditional literary conventions do not seem to be there. There is no great plot with a customary beginning, middle and it certainly does not end. However, should the reader expect these Victorian standards of fiction from a writer in the 1890s? Could it not be that Barrie was also one of the experimentalists, playing around with or exploiting the expected conventions?

Another explanation is that Barrie's talent for writing articles allowed him to develop a style particularly suited to serialisation. Barrie did not write *ST* specifically for *Scribner's Magazine*, and whether he chose the instalment breaks

or not is unclear. Whether it was an authorial or editorial decision, the influence of Barrie's journalistic background made the job easy. Throughout the book there are little asides, or sketches that can be argued have come from his earlier collections of journalistic work.⁵¹ Practically each chapter, not to mention each instalment, contains a cameo tale, which is a quality desirable in a serial because it must cater for three potential readers. The attention of a reader approaching the serial for the first time had to be captured, in order to entice him to read again next month, while the occasional reader required an instalment which could stand on its own, and the seasoned reader had to be kept contented by continuing the progression of the tale.

The Academy review reflects that the narrative of *ST* seems to be allowed to develop in whichever direction it desires. Barrie parodies his own style when the narrator introduces the two new teachers:

Here if the writer dared (but you would be so angry) he would introduce at the length of a chapter two brand-new characters, the Misses Langlands and Oram, who suddenly present themselves to him in the most sympathetic light [. . .] - it is hard to pass on without dwelling on these things, and indeed - but pass on we must.

(*ST*, p. 394-5)

The fictional narrator's imagination is presented as being so vivid, and his knowledge of the tale so comprehensive, that he could easily imagine sketches involving peripheral characters perpetually. Moreover, the impression is left that Barrie knows the background to every character, no matter how insignificant, and that his selection is, therefore, more discriminating than it at first appears.⁵²

In the review of *ST* in *Good Words*, Barrie is compared favourably to Gaskell by Sir George Douglas. In Barrie's work he finds 'a depth of humour and of feeling [. . .] which is beyond the authoress of "*Cranford*," fine artist as she was'. Additionally, having read *ST*, he is prepared 'to maintain that the advantage, in some of the highest points is no longer with Dickens'.⁵³ It seems likely that Barrie would have been perturbed by the last definition. In 1891, eight years before

Douglas's review, Barrie had condemned a similar comparison regarding Rudyard Kipling as 'mere cruelty to a young man. A Dickens should never be expected'.⁵⁴ Thus the battle between the authors and the critics for the dominant definition of writers in general, and themselves specifically, continued.

Douglas also argues that works such as Barrie's have 'a unique and special value', due to the fact that they are not dominated by the 'individualism at war with the social order' which was so popular.⁵⁵ Praise for an old style of literature, in this way, became very frequent in the press at this time as another reaction to what Sally Ledger calls 'the moral rearguard action which followed the Wilde trials' of 1895.⁵⁶ Harry Quilter feels safe after the 'fall of the great high-priest of æstheticsim' to foresee a move away from the decadence of the recent years back to the 'old-fashioned story-teller'.⁵⁷ Barrie had never been tarred with the decadent brush and Holbrook Jackson reflects that along with Conan Doyle and Conrad, he was one of the writers who emerged from the 1890s milieu, but who was 'sufficiently general in attitude not to have been of any particular movement'.⁵⁸ Refusing to affiliate himself with one movement not only enabled Barrie to move between them all, be it the Celtic Revival or children's, but made a definition of his position in the field even harder to determine. *ST* allows a glimpse into Barrie's own conscious consideration of his position at the time as well as revealing his position as defined objectively within the contemporary field.

**'Tommy could not tell what it was. He and the
saying about art for art's sake were in the streets
that night, looking for each other'.**

(*ST*, p. 83)

Aware of the debates surrounding publishing generally, and himself particularly, Barrie produced a fictional work addressing his own definition of the artist. The world created in *Sentimental Tommy* is inhabited by wonderful actors

and actresses, people who hide their true identities behind fabricated ones. Both Tommy's parents are presented as masters of deception by virtue of their imaginations. Jean Myles, his mother, constructs a completely new identity in London to cast revenge on Thrums, whilst Magerful Tam, his father, can fool a town into thinking he is his own father in order to destroy the latter. In Thrums itself, there is Miss Ailie pretending to be her dead sister to allow her to continue a correspondence with Ivie McLean, and the Painted Lady. The Painted Lady is a more literal adaptation of the need to disguise a true identity and Barrie even has her kitchen 'trying successfully to be something else' (*ST*, p.178). This section considers *ST* as Barrie's attempt to re-define the artist within the conflict between the two sub-fields operating in the field of cultural production. His journalism has already shown some of his opinions on aesthetic matters, revealing the conflicting principles of valuation within the field, and another early composition is helpful to define the issues which will be discussed here.

In *The Greenwood Hat* Barrie reprinted some of the articles he had written between 1885 and 1887. Among the chosen few is a piece entitled 'Was He a Genius?', a discussion in which he considers what genius is and whether he is one or not. He concludes that it has two constituent parts:

we can shut out all the definitions [of genius] but two: namely, power without effort, to which I must plead guilty, and a 'creative working in strict accordance with the nature and fitness of things.' I am not sure what this means, but I feel I have it.³⁹

Most of the attributes which are given to the artist in *ST* can be similarly associated with these two characteristics of genius. A consideration of both elements reiterates what was found in his journalistic pieces, that Barrie was conscious of, but disagreed with the extreme opinions held in both the sub-fields of restricted and large-scale production. Like James, Barrie was seeking as sub-sub-field of restricted production within the field of large-scale production, but while James

wanted to enter from the field of restricted production, Barrie needed to find a way in from the field of large-scale production.

Through his presentation of Tommy, Barrie suggests various interpretations of the ambiguous phrase, 'creative working in strict accordance with the nature and fitness of things' used to describe genius. First, an artist must guard against sensationalism. Second, he must be aware of any consequences which may result from his work and be willing to take responsibility for them. Third, there must be a realistic dimension in art, dependent on the artist's knowledge and belief in his work. Each of these criteria position Barrie against at least one of the groups in the field of restricted production: the decadents.

When Barrie suggests that the function organised by the Society for the Reformation of Juvenile Criminals takes place on the night that Tommy and 'the saying art for art's sake were in the streets [. . .] looking for each other' he immediately introduces contemporary debates surrounding the decadents. In the 1890s the Paterian phrase was inextricably linked with Wilde and his personal reinterpretation, but in order for the phrase to survive post-1895 it had to be re-defined. The month before the phrase appeared in Barrie's serial, the readers of *Scribner's* were offered one such new interpretation:

Art for Art's sake means not merely that we are not to preach or to tell stories in our pictures, but that we are not to follow fads or catch at sensations, not to try for money or for notoriety; that we are to think not what is profitable or fashionable, but what is good.

(XIX, p.125)

Thus, *Scribner's* states that it is sensation for its own sake which could no longer to be accepted as art and, in this respect, *ST* is in agreement. Re-defining the doctrine, by denouncing the most feared aspects of the decadents' manifesto, allowed Barrie to accept the principle of art for art's sake, at a time when it was widely condemned, without alienating the popular audience.

'The fitness of things', implies, first, that it is important that the artist guards himself against sensationalism, an aspect explicitly brought to the attention of the reader during the interlude at the S. R. J. C. The Society, comprising of the wealthy people of London, held a party each year for young offenders who, when released, had repented. Although he was not a genuine offender, Tommy's friend Shovel had acquired a ticket, and therefore had to enlist Tommy's help to invent a convincing scenario. Together they had attended the function where most of the ladies were 'sweet women, fighting bravely for these boys'. Shovel's patroness was the exception because she 'had come for a sensation' (*ST*, p. 86). Barrie's castigation of the woman is clear. After boasting to the resident clergyman that she had discovered the most delightful monster, the clergyman 'looked after her half in sadness, half sarcastically; he was thinking that he had discovered a monster also' (*ST*, p. 86).

Tommy is the 'delightful monster' who, in order to please the lady, creates stories which even the narrator deems too awful to reveal. Tommy manages to relate a plausible crime-story because he 'half-believe[s] it' (*ST*, p. 87), but only until he remembers Elspeth, his God-fearing younger sister. It is then that he interrupts the prayers which were intended for the redemption of the boys and asks those in the hall to pray for his patroness who, 'the worse I said I were the better pleased were she' (*ST*, p. 89). It is all too much for Tommy and he collapses.

Moreover, the conscious wish to cause sensation is a desire given to the least virtuous character in the book, Magerful Tam. Tam would dress up to look like his father and cause havoc in Redlintie, not only as an act of revenge, but because 'to make a sensation was what he valued above all things' (*ST*, p. 109). Such descriptions of 'sensation' distance Barrie from the decadent aesthetes in the field of restricted production. Barrie knew that artists, in particular, were susceptible to sensationalism. Tommy, like all artists, needed someone to applaud him and this

need could be exploited in two ways; either he could be tempted into sensation by people like the patroness, or, like his father, he could use his talent for evil ends.

The latter temptation introduces a second subject linked inextricably with the decadents; the question of authorial responsibility. Barrie's opinions on this are shown for the first time, briefly, by Tommy's remorse at the S. R. J. C. when he realises that the patroness is 'turned on' by his macabre stories. They are then explored more fully in an episode involving his sister, Elspeth. For years Tommy had tormented Elspeth with the fact she did not belong to the family. He insisted that he had actually taken the legitimate child, Reddy, away and allowed Elspeth to take her place. In a moment of crisis he tells her that Grizel is in fact Reddy.

Tommy's story has been so convincing and consistent throughout the years that Elspeth cannot but believe that this is the truth. Being a godly creature, she realises that she should swap places with Grizel, but she cannot bring herself either to be parted from Tommy, or to live with the Painted Lady. She reaches a compromise whereby she will keep Tommy, but give Grizel all her other possessions, a decision which requires her to make the 'dangerous' trip to Double Dykes on her own. Tommy, once he has realised what has happened, knows that it is his artfulness which has placed her in danger and he denounces himself: 'what a black he had been!' (*ST*, p. 176). Tommy consciously sees the negative results that can arise from his actions and highlights the fact that Barrie still considers authors to be responsible for the tales they tell. He has not accepted Wilde's extreme view that 'an ethical sympathy in an artist is an unpardonable mannerism of style'.⁶⁰

The final aspect concerning the 'fitness of things' involves Barrie's opinions with regard to the contemporary debate about realism, encompassing as it did the general disapproval of French naturalism at this time. Barrie considered the subject of realism more fully in his writings for the *Contemporary Review* as a literary critic, attempting as Gissing had, to define the ambiguous term. First, in a critical

essay on Baring-Gould he distances himself from the naturalism, currently in vogue:

Even in a White-chapel court, life is not all blows and blasphemy. It is many-coloured. It has sons and daughters who do sublime things for their mothers sake, its tender husbands, and its glee. Dickens knew better than to be always writing of the poor on black-edged notepaper.⁶¹

The extreme type of representation offered by naturalism denied art the element of entertainment which Barrie considered to be essential. The reality which he endeavours to achieve, therefore, is more complex than merely depicting the hitherto unspoken aspects of life.

For Barrie 'realism' meant something quite different. He explains that, although he thought Baring-Gould to be both clever and sincere, he found his novels painful to read because of their 'want of sympathy'.⁶² As an example, he criticises Baring-Gould for creating a scene where a young wife enjoys a 'jaunt to a lively fair' only a few days after her husband's apparent death. Barrie writes, 'it never seems to strike the author that such callousness would be painful in even a less amiable person'.⁶³ In another review he similarly chastises Meredith for placing words in his characters' mouths so they 'then [. . .] talk as the persons we had conceived could never talk, and we lose grip of them'.⁶⁴ Barrie wished to evoke emotions in the readers in the form of pity or joy, a desire deemed different from striving for mere sensation. In order to evoke any reaction, however, the writing must be convincing and this, in Barrie's opinion, could only be achieved through authorial consistency and sympathy with the characters.

Barrie believed that there had to be reality and sincerity within his artifice. Therefore, Tommy, as Barrie's representative artist, constantly tries on 'other folk's feelings' (*ST*, p. 335) to prevent him making mistakes similar to Baring-Gould and Meredith. In the same way, Barrie tried to be true to his characters and his work despite external demands. In October, a letter from Scribner's requested that 'a

piece of needlessly repellent description' concerning Tommy's mother and her rags be omitted from the second instalment of *ST*.⁶⁵ In reply Barrie wrote that 'it is a painful passage, but I knew it as such, I feel that it belongs to this book, so I prefer it to remain'.⁶⁶ He knew that it may offend the audience, but yet he also knew that it belonged in the book and he refused to be influenced by his editor. The passage, therefore, does appear in the serial, but not in the book form because in the intervening period 'several men' whose opinion Barrie valued had agreed with Scribner's that 'the paragraph about the mother's cough and rags should be modified'.⁶⁷ Barrie was not going to be swayed by just anyone, even his publisher, if he did not respect their opinion and consider them to have a 'legitimate voice in literary matters'.⁶⁸

To attain sincerity in art an artist required, in Barrie's opinion, 'the faculty of stepping into other people's shoes and remaining there until he became someone else' (*ST*, p.187). Naturally, however, there was the more accessible resource of walking in their own shoes, and as with Gissing, some of the incidents in *ST* are taken from Barrie's life. For example, in *The Greenwood Hat* Barrie reveals that the mourning episode is based on an apparently personal experience.⁶⁹ This introduces the recurring problem of autobiography versus art. Gaining inspiration from reality, for Barrie, did not degrade the art, but added to its integrity, attested to by his only criticism of Hardy. In a critical essay, Barrie argues that when Hardy ventures out of Wessex he is 'comparatively colourless'. He comments on the works Hardy set in London: 'London [. . .] must have been known to him, at least superficially, but [it is] strange to the Wessex he has by heart, and by attempting to draw [it] he fails absolutely'.⁷⁰ The artist should have a deep knowledge and understanding of the situation he wishes to portray if he is not to risk the readers losing faith in his creation, and thus destroying its effectiveness.

Tommy is presented as creating very effective art. Barrie makes him literally suffer as a result of his imagination and ingenuity combining with his desire to

make his stories as believable as possible. While playing, Corp notices Tommy's hand:

There was indeed an ugly gash on Tommy's hand. 'You've been hacking at yoursel' again,' said the distressed Corp, who knew that in his enthusiasm Tommy had more than once drawn blood from himself. 'When you take it a' so real as that [. . .] I near think we should it give up.'

(ST, p. 311)

This quirk is continued in *Tommy and Grizel* when Tommy deliberately hurts his ankle to ensure that people believe a contrived version of events. The true artist must half-believe his tales to ensure the sympathy which Barrie believed crucial to good literature, but must guard against suffering as a result. The writer, like a child, has to merge fantasy with reality. His difficulty lies in articulating it in the subconscious way that a child can achieve so easily.

Tommy's temperament is perfect for creating the type of reality which Barrie promotes. There 'never was a more sympathetic nature than Tommy's. At every time of his life his pity was easily aroused for persons in distress' (ST, p. 264). He could 'laugh or cry merely because other people were laughing or crying, or even with less reason, and so naturally that he found it more difficult to stop than begin' (ST, p. 81). It is this inherent ability that allows him to constantly extricate himself from difficult situations by 'finding a wy'.

The phrase to 'find a wy' is used throughout the work as an indication that an artist is about to set to work. The first time it is used is when Tommy creates the system for the poor to pay secretly for 'The three Ps' - Peats and Potatoes with Propriety. On this occasion, like the others, Tommy finds the answer by thinking himself into the position of those whom he wishes to help. Tommy, sequentially, 'finds a wy' to help Corp by becoming Corp, complete with his fits deceiving Mr Ogivly; to placate both Grizel and Elspeth by giving his sweets to The Painted Lady; to acquire *Waverley* by deceiving Miss Ailie with arguments she herself

would use; to restore the Jacobites and conversely to slay them; to find out the nature of the relationship between Miss Ailie and Mr McLean; and to allow Punch and Judy to be performed without offence. Each incident requires Tommy to play a different rôle depending on whom he wished to deceive or help, demonstrating his natural sympathy with others and a consequent notion of what is appropriate on each occasion.

This natural understanding of 'the fitness of things' is best illustrated through Tommy's letter-writing enterprise. Cathro, one of the teachers, had been in the habit of writing letters 'for such of the populace as could not guide a pen' (*ST*, p. 410). Occasionally, he exploited his power by refusing to write exactly what was demanded. Tommy soon filled this gap in the market, and his masterpiece was the letter he wrote to Mrs. Dinnie at Betsy's request. Betsy and Mrs. Dinnie's daughter, Janet had made a pact to get married on the same day, but Janet had died. Now Betsy had to write to Mrs Dinnie telling her of her own imminent marriage, while also sending her commiserations. When she had approached Tommy she had initially thought that he was 'no auld enough for this ane' (*ST*, p. 418). However, the marriage was taking place because of the success of the letter Tommy wrote which 'had a tear in every sentence' (*ST*, p. 418).

To Cathro's enquiry regarding the conception of the letter to Mrs Dinnie, Tommy replies, 'I think I thought I was Betsy at the time' (*ST*, p. 420). This reveals that his research contained more than mere imagination, however, for he had walked three miles to check that a weeping willow *could* hang low enough to kiss Janet's grave. But, it is not until Tommy admits why he had chosen to exclude another beautiful scene with the weeping willow, that the true artistic instinct is uncovered:

'It was because, though it is a beautiful thing in itself, I felt a servant lassie wouldna' have thought o't. I was sweer [. . .] but I cut it out.' Again Cathro admired, reluctantly. The hack does feel the difference between himself and the artist. Cathro might possibly have had the idea, he could not have cut it out.

(ST, p. 421)⁷¹

Tommy, therefore, would not allow anyone to utter anything incongruous, nor *could* he for he had a subconscious talent for stepping into the required character.

The letters also indicate that the 'fitness of things' is connected with a consideration of audience demands. Another letter requires him to write to Meggy's sister because circumstances are such that she needs to ask her for help for their mother's upkeep. Tommy does not need to create a letter because he realises that it is Meggy's own words that will have the greatest effect on this particular recipient. To Tommy's greater credit it is not a conscious realisation:

It was a call from the heart which transported Katherine to Thrums in a second of time [. . .]. Tommy did not put all this to himself but he felt it, and after that he *could not* have written the letter differently. Happy Tommy! To be an artist is a great thing, but to be an artist and not know it is the most glorious thing in the world.

(ST, p. 413)

Therefore, for Barrie an awareness of the audience and a sympathy, or love, for the characters makes for a better artist than the more popular and contrary contemporary opinions held by the modern novelists in the Piccadilly club.⁷²

Barrie makes Tommy work 'in strict accordance with the nature and fitness of things' and on the rare times when he does not he is implicitly criticised. Each of the three interpretations of this phrase which I have offered position Barrie ostensibly at odds with opinions held in the sub-field of restricted production. He advocates lack of sensation, an acknowledgement of author responsibility, sympathy with characters and a consideration of the audience. The second

definition of a genius - someone who has power without effort - initially compounds this view.

The idea of 'power without effort' encompasses Barrie's earlier views on self-consciousness. As illustrated in 'Brought Back from Elysium' it was a characteristic, held primarily by those functioning in the field of restricted production, which Barrie felt had nothing to add to the creation of art and which could indeed damage it. *ST* gives primacy to the imagination; natural instincts are given supremacy over the contrived. The value of these instincts are demonstrated through the actions of children as a comment on the inherent ability of children to 'see' situations better than adults. When Tommy and Elspeth are watching the Painted Lady, Tommy warns Elspeth to remember that she is 'an ill one'. To this she replies, 'She looks as if she didna ken that hersel'' and the narrator explains that 'these words of a child are the best picture we can hope to get of the Painted Lady' (*ST*, p. 180).

ST begins with Tommy as a very young child questioning his mother 'artlessly' (*ST*, p. 2) and it is the very artlessness which is shown to affect his mother most. This renews the theme of the new child of literature expounding the virtues which childhood has. Such natural artlessness is endangered by self-consciousness, normally accompanied by adulthood. Once self-conscious it is difficult to return, as Tommy's later experience demonstrates:

at times his mind would wander backwards unbidden to those distant days, and then he saw flitting dimly through them the elusive form of a child. He knew it was himself, and for moments he could see it clearly, but when he moved a step nearer it was not there. So does the child we once were play hide-and-seek with us among the mists of infancy, until one day he trips and falls into the daylight. Then we seize him, and with that touch we two are one. It is the birth of self-consciousness.

(*ST*, p. 19-20)

An artist must retain some of the unconscious art of his childhood, or at the very least be wary of self-consciousness. Under these conditions Cathro is right to be

concerned about Tommy's presence in his class because 'Tommy had made him self-conscious' (*ST*, p. 224).

Self-consciousness in 'Brought Back from Elysium' was linked with the 'artist' who insisted on categories for writers and believed that there was an 'art of fiction'. In *ST*, Barrie is consistent with his former argument; the best art cannot be taught or self-consciously learnt. This paradoxically places Barrie in conflict with the positions in the field of large-scale production condoning the democratisation of the whole field. The real power in the artist is that which is within him, naturally. Here, a difference is made between the instincts of all children and the natural instincts of an artist. Shovel, a normal child, is the foil to Tommy, a young artist.⁷³ Of the two boys it is only Tommy who has the imagination and this elevates him above Shovel.

While Shovel 'knew everything [. . .] Tommy knew other things' and it was these other things which were 'best worth hearing of' (*ST*, p. 25). An artist has a form of knowledge which cannot be learnt. Tommy has not been taught an 'art of fiction', but he has something which is absent in others. This is explicitly shown when Shovel has to ask Tommy to create a story for the S. R. J. C. It is a 'proud moment for Tommy, as Shovel's knowledge of crime was much more extensive than his own' (*ST*, p. 79), but Shovel is forced to ask for he lacked 'the imagination that made Tommy such an ornament to the house' (*ST*, p. 79). A person can have equal, or superior, factual knowledge to an artist, but without an imagination they will never be an artist in their own right. Thus, Barrie is, in effect, negating the usefulness of the literary manuals, which can only ever teach the facts of composition.

The artist has a certain brand of 'cleverness' which the man-on-the-street does not. It is this inherent power which can make someone an artist, but Barrie also investigates the dubious value of this power. In this way the work exposes the dual economy functioning within the field of cultural production. In a letter to

Quiller-Couch in the year of *ST*'s publication Barrie shows his understanding of its reversed economy more explicitly. The letter was occasioned by the low sales of Q's latest novel, *Ia*.

I should feel very miserable if I thought you were getting despondent about your books because they have not a large sale. Why, there is not any other young man *trying* to write, trying to think, attempting to look down into life at all. Go back to the *Dead Man's Rock* business and you will be at once in the running with the most popular men of the day. That is the kind of thing they are all doing. But go on doing your best and you have a reward which is the only real reward and as it seems to me the only thing that makes this calling of letters a manly one.⁷⁴

The examinations for the bursary and the Blackadder Prize are the most important incidents when considering Barrie's thoughts on the power and value of art. Tommy does not win the bursary which would have allowed him to go to Aberdeen, but the reader has been prepared for this outcome. Earlier, in reply to McLean's assertion that Tommy is a remarkable boy, Dr. MacQueen admits that he is 'no sure that it's the remarkable boys who carry the bursaries' (*ST*, p. 314). Tommy's temperament is not one which will win purely academic competitions, a state of affairs demonstrated when Tommy is shown *acting* as auctioneer at the sale of the Painted Lady's possessions when he should have been at his books. Even when he tries to study his imagination prevents him. Elspeth's passing remark that she thinks he is working so hard that he will kill himself results in him discovering himself later 'far away from his books, looking on at his affecting death and counting the mourners at the funeral' (*ST*, p. 409). It requires a great deal of effort from Tommy to revise for exams, but none to utilise his imagination.

It is not until after the Blackadder Prize that the reader is shown how the artist in Tommy would have prevented him from winning, even if he had studied. He explains to Elspeth what had happened:

At the bursary examinations there was some English we had to turn into Latin, and it said, 'No man ever attained supreme eminence who worked for mere lucre; such efforts must ever be bounded by base mediocrity. None shall climb high but he who climbs for love, for in truth where the heart is, there alone shall the treasure be found.' Elspeth, it came ower me in a clink how true that was, and I sat saying it to myself, though I saw Gav Dishart and Willie Simpson and the rest beginning to put it into Latin at once, as little ta'en up wi' the words as if they had been about auld Hannibal.

(*ST*, p. 447)

It is not hard to predict that Gav and Willie would win the bursaries. Tommy will forever be influenced by art over material gains, interested more in the beauty of the sentiment recorded in the quote than the need to translate it as quickly and accurately as possible into Latin; in other words he is interested in art for art's sake. The quote, itself, challenges those in the extreme position of the field of large-scale production, and the position in which some external forces today would place Barrie himself.⁷⁵ Barrie is stating that any art that is produced solely for financial gain will be, at best, only average.

That is not to imply that Barrie condemns monetary reward. In most instances Tommy does gain from his stories, sometimes financially. He receives money for the letters he composes and is paid for the scheme he invents for the poor. This does not, however, diminish the work which Tommy has created, because financial gain was not his prime motivation. The reasons for Tommy 'findin' a wy', or flexing his artistic muscles suggest the way in which Barrie wished to function within the dual economy of the field.

When Reddy asks Tommy if he knows any stories his first instinct is to tell her all about Thrums 'and was about to do it for love' (*ST*, p. 9), before he realises that he can use the stories. With his tales he can tempt her out of the stairwell and away from his mother and his stories will acquire a purpose outwith themselves. He has the artist's initial desire, however, to tell the stories for their own sake. Equally, he has an ambivalent attitude towards money. Cathro explains to McLean why

Tommy is mourning for a fellow pupil. Lewis's father had died, but unfortunately it was the start of the kickbonnety season and Lewis was finding mourning difficult. Tommy offered to 'swop (sic) jackets every morning for a week or two, and thus [be] properly attired to do the mourning for him' (ST, p. 334). McLean asked what fee Tommy had charged:

'Not a farthing, sir - which gives another uncanny glint into his character. When he wants money, there's none so crafty at getting it, but he did this for the pleasure of the thing, or, as he said to Lewis, 'to feel what it would be like.' That, I tell you, is the nature of the sacket; he has a devouring desire to try on other folk's feelings, as if they were so many suits of clothes.

(ST, p. 335)

An artist should be propelled by a natural love of 'story-telling' not by the temptation of money. However, the acceptance of financial reward, for Barrie, did not preclude symbolic value. If an author motivated by natural instincts happened to receive mass recognition he had accomplished 'power without effort' and was classed, by Barrie at least, as a genius.⁷⁶

Although an artist has the natural power of his imagination, he must work to create perfection. 'Power without effort' does not mean 'power without thought' and in this way Barrie distances himself further from the field of large-scale production. Having seen Tommy fail to gain a bursary, Cathro, at Grizel's suggestion, puts him forward for the Blackadder Prize. Initially it appears that this is the perfect competition for Tommy. Each contestant must write an essay on a topic provided on the day. Composition of literature had been discussed in the surrounding articles in *Scribner's* and Barrie would doubtless have agreed with the article by Robert Blum which reflects that 'art is no more accidental than it is trifling' (XIX, p. 5). This attitude is reiterated by Stevenson in his 'Vailima Table-Talk'. His advice to any young writer is to 'first make his words go sweet, and if he can't spend an afternoon turning a single phrase he'd better give up the profession

of literature' (XIX, p. 547). Tommy shows himself worthy of the profession by the careful consideration given to his Hugh Blackadder essay.

The essay is to be in Scots which is to be an advantage to a lad brought up for the first ten years in London for it will have, 'set him a-thinking about the words he uses' (ST, p. 434). Already the reader has confidence in Tommy's imagination, which allows for him to look calmly confident with a topic about which his opponent knew far more; 'A Day in Church'. His powers of imagination, married to sympathy, merits such confidence and, therefore, Tommy should win. In losing though he personifies the final attribute of the artist; the desire for perfection. Barrie had seen this search for perfection in others whom he respected. David Masson, Professor of Rhetoric and Belles-Lettres during Barrie's time at Edinburgh University, is described in a way that will be echoed in Tommy. In *An Edinburgh Eleven* Barrie wrote:

It was when his mind groped for an image that he clutched the bracket. He seemed to tear his good things out of it. Silence overcame the class. Some were fascinated by the man; others trembled for the bracket. It shook, it groaned, and yielded. Masson said another of the things that made his lectures literature; the crisis had passed.⁷⁷

Similarly, Tommy has to grope for the image which will turn his essay into literature, and he would rather fail than compromise. He wished to describe how many people were in the church. It was not that he could not find *a* word; he had thought of many. The problem was he could not find the *right* word; the word to describe exactly the amount of people he so clearly envisaged in the church. For him essay writing was not the art of 'using the first word that comes and hurrying on' (ST, p. 438), as suggested by Mr. Duthie, but to reproduce for others what he imagined, an act neither trifling, nor accidental. The result is that Tommy fails to complete his essay and forfeits the prize. The hour had 'gone by just like winking; he had forgotten all about time while searching his mind for the word' (ST, p. 437).

Importantly, unlike the American Analyst in Barrie's earlier work, Tommy's attempt is not undertaken self-consciously. Tommy understands the annoyance of the others, but cannot understand the respect which his actions produce in Mr. Ogilvy. He does not realise what he has done. A true artist must juggle successfully the need to search for perfection, without becoming, nor making the work, self-conscious. As Ogilvy explains, 'He *had* to think of it till he got it - and he got it. The laddie is a genius!' (ST, p. 440). Tommy becomes an artist in Ogilvy's eyes because he considers the word long after he has lost the competition, that is, long after he has anything to gain except the perfect impression he wished to convey.

This episode illustrates the varying fortunes of the new journalist and the struggling artist in a way similar to Gissing. Tommy's opponent, McLauchlan is artistically inferior and can only start to write once he has 'ceased to think' (ST, p. 435), but as Cathro had indicated earlier the 'hack is sometimes, or usually, or nearly always the artist's master' (ST, p. 421). The less thought is rewarded with the most financial gain and a corresponding financial power, while the artist has to live on his reputation alone.

The only prize which Tommy wins is Ogilvy's respect, but Barrie presents this as a more valuable reward than the scholarship. Positive consecration by a fellow artist is worth more than any material prize. Bourdieu shows that the effect of prize-giving can be seen as disastrous by some artists. As in the case of the Blackadder Prize, true art is often misinterpreted in such competitions and, indeed, to win a literary prize can devalue the work symbolically. Bourdieu writes that 'Minuit would be devalued in the eyes of the hundred people around Saint-Germain who really count if it won the *Prix Concourt* [. . .] intellectuals think less of writers who win prizes' (Field, p. 100) and since it is these very people whom an artist wishes to influence, a prize can be a disaster. Bourdieu emphasises the need for consecration by other artists again and again stating that 'few people

depend as much as artists and intellectuals do for their self-image upon the image others, and particularly other writers and artists, have of them' (*Field*, p. 116).

Mr Ogilvy's thoughts come closest to explicitly presenting Barrie's own views on literature and the suffering of an artist. Mr Ogilvy approaches writing:

reverently, as if it were a maid of more than mortal purity.
And it is, and because he knew this she let him see her face,
which will ever be hidden from those who look not for the
soul, and to help him nearer to her came assistance in strange
guise, the loss of loved ones, dolour unutterable; but still she
was beyond his reach [. . .] her luminous eyes sorrowful
because she was not for him, and she bent impulsively toward
him, so that once or twice in a long life he touched her fingers,
and a heavenly spark was lit, for he had risen higher than
himself, and that is literature.

(*ST*, p. 433)

This is not the 'art as a trade' preached in the field of large-scale production by the New Journalist, nor is the democratic view of literature held by Besant. To reach true art an artist must suffer and struggle in the hope that once in a while he will obtain his goal. Ogilvy reiterates the need for sympathy in writing that is constant throughout Tommy's exploits, but also he introduces another aspect of the artist, which Barrie barely touches on in this novel, but develops in *Tommy and Grizel*. The artist needs to respect art and be aware that it has power over him more often than vice versa.

It is because only Ogilvy recognises the symbolic value of his effort that Tommy does not win the Blackadder Prize. In this episode Barrie demonstrates that the symbolic value of art is often not recognised, a problem aggravated by the fact that it is also difficult to categorise. Barrie only allows two sections of the community to recognise Tommy's inherent value. The first is the children who recognise it because they are drawn to it. Although his fellow-pupils were irritated by Tommy's reminiscences about London, they also 'found it difficult to keep away from him' (*ST*, p. 160). They have not yet been conditioned to judge everything by its monetary value alone. The second category is the teachers in

Thrums. They realise that there is something different about Tommy but even they cannot pinpoint it.

Tommy's relationships with his teachers are significant. Bourdieu's admits that the 'educational system plays a decisive role in the generalized imposition of the legitimate mode of consumption' (*Field*, p. 37). This is because a consideration of the production of the value of work does not stop after the primary creators or those who may act on the market, either by verdicts of consecration or regulatory matters - publishers, critics, gallery directors. It must also include the part played by:

the members of institutions which work towards the production of producers (schools of fine arts, etc.) and towards the production of consumers capable of recognizing the work of art as such, that is as a value, starting with teachers and parents, in charge of the initial inculcation of artistic dispositions. (Rules, p. 229)

It is Tommy's teachers who recognise that his qualities have some type of value. It is Miss Ailie who first suggests that he is a 'remarkable boy'. However, when pressed to explain herself more fully she can only say that, 'there was something wonderful about Tommy, you felt it, but you could not quite give it a name [. . .] sometimes he is like a boy inspired' (*ST*, p. 222). Cathro, is later reticent to say whether Tommy will get a bursary or not because he is baffled by the boy. He admits that:

To be candid [. . .] I don't think he could study, in the big meaning of the word. I daresay I'm wrong, but I have a feeling that whatever knowledge that boy acquires he will dig out of himself. There is something inside him, or so I think at times, that is his master, and rebels against book-learning. No, I can't tell what it is.

(*ST*, p. 337-8)

It is only those who understand the reversed economy of the field who can recognise and appreciate symbolic values, only those who can recognise cultural

products who can appreciate them. Consequently, promising artists must expect to find a lack of acceptance in many others. What use is this unnamed talent if it cannot win Tommy the bursary? This intolerance is exacerbated by the fact that an artistic temperament may also preclude an artist from making money elsewhere. Cathro explains that if Tommy was sent 'soldiering [. . .] he would have a sudden impulse to fight on the wrong side' (*ST*, p. 338).

Tommy eventually understands that there are 'two kinds of cleverness, the kind you learn from books and a kind that is in yourself', and he has the latter kind. Aaron's opinion is that, 'he can take it wi' him to the herding, then, and see if it'll keep the cattle frae stravaiging' (*ST*, p. 427). Aaron is not party to the system of reversed economy which functions in the field of cultural production. Unlike Barrie, symbolic value has no value in Aaron's world; the values of the sub-field of restricted production are irrelevant, if not incomprehensible.

Harry Geduld's opinion of the 'Tommy' novels is divided. On the one hand he believes the portrait of Tommy, as a study of the mind of a child, to be 'at once credible and entertaining'.⁷⁸ He has his doubts, however, about considering it as having any greater significance, and in fact warns against attributing too much to *ST*:

The only temperament enlightened is Barrie's, and it is therefore absurd to over praise the novel as a kind of universal *kunstlerroman*, like Joyce's *Portrait of a Young Man*, or Mann's *Tonio Kröger*.⁷⁹

In depreciating the novel in this way, Geduld is accepting too much. He is accepting that because of episodes like the mourning scene the novel is pure autobiography and also that Barrie's temperament does not deserve the attention given to others. What he is failing to do is read beneath the surface level.

I have argued that within this book Barrie revealed his own redefinition of the artist, as well as his consciousness of being trapped in the field's conflict. To define an artist, Barrie did not need to step into anyone else's shoes because he believed himself to be one and it is in this respect that the book deserves attention. Unfortunately, the novels which he wrote occurred between two phases in his writing career and are consequently often overlooked. On the one hand they are too closely related to his journalism appearing whilst this initial phase in his development had not yet been completely abandoned. On the other, they fall in the shadows of the plays that were to follow and become Barrie's great achievements. Thomas D. Knowles succinctly describes what happened after the successful staging of *Quality Street* (1901). He writes, that 'thereafter Barrie the playwright ousted Barrie the novelist, and his nineties fiction was, in retrospect, judged accordingly: as an apprenticeship for his development into drama'.⁸⁰ The later productions in Barrie's career have, as Bourdieu, explains that they may, transformed the conditions of reception of his earlier work.

Barrie was being categorised as a journalist or popular novelist at a time when neither position was complimentary. Leslie Stephen wrote that the relationship between an author and a journalist was one of 'incompatibility. So far as a man becomes a journalist, he ceases to be an author, and *vice versa*'.⁸¹ Barrie suggests that there are actually many positions between, one being that of the literary journalist. *ST* represents a protest against a simplistic placement of him in the field of large-scale production. More specifically, it is a protest against the attendant belief that his work could hold no symbolic value. Barrie was making a stand for the artist who held the same values as artists in the field of restricted production, but could not afford to function there. He is the real position between the fictional positions held by Milvain and Biffen, demonstrating points of conflict with both sub-fields. Knowles points out that in the 'choice between serious art and pot-boiling, the writer could attempt both alternatively, using formula to finance

experiment'.⁸² This is the position which Peter McDonald assigns to Arnold Bennett, who chose to lead a 'double life as a profiteering serialist and an avant-garde literary novelist' in an attempt to 'negotiate the treacherous dialectic which divided the purist from the profiteer'.⁸³ There was another, arguably more intelligent, alternative, which was to combine the two within the one piece of work, as I feel Barrie has done in *ST* and as he did in 'Ndintpile Pont'. He was neither consciously popular, nor elitist, but he was aware of both attitudes and attempted to define himself between the two, and his work reflects this conflict, and his position within it.

Barrie cannot be placed in the field of restricted production. He is not ashamed to take money for his work and indeed very early in his career exploited the material side of the field. In *The Greenwood Hat*, Barrie divulges that he 'began to use sub-titles [. . .] as soon as he realised that they were worth another sixpence'.⁸⁴ He also decries some of the characteristics shown by those in this field, chastising the self-consciousness which leads to endless debate, categorisation and bickering amongst 'artists' but little creation of art. Neither does he understand the rejection of audience and author-responsibility.

It is easier, therefore to place him in the field of large-scale production. It is a close reading of his own work, in this case his redefinition of the artist in *ST*, however, which makes such a placement equally dubious. He hits out at the power of the press and denies the existence of an 'art of fiction' which can be taught, thus challenging the democratisation of writing. *ST* shows Barrie not only defining an artist, but redefining his position within the field. Existing as a successful journalist and afterwards as a popular novelist in the 1890s, while believing in the symbolic value of his work, Barrie *had* to define his own position.

Endnotes: Chapter Four

- ¹ Arnold Bennett, *The Author's Craft* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1914), p. 108.
- ² Phrase taken from Theodor W. Adorno, *The Culture Industry: Selected Essays on Mass Culture*, ed. by J. M. Bernstein (London: Routledge, 1991), p. 85.
- ³ Peter D. McDonald, *British Literary Culture and Publishing Practice, 1880-1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 14.
- ⁴ Unsigned, 'The Journalist in Fiction', *The Church Quarterly Review*, 36 (1893), 73-92 (p. 89). Further references to this article are given after quotations in the text.
- ⁵ H. G. Wells, *The Country of the Blind and Other Stories* (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, [1911]), p. v.
- ⁶ Aline Gorren, 'The Ethics of Modern Journalism', *Scribner's Magazine*, 19 (1896), 507-13 (p. 507). All references to *Scribner's Magazine* will be taken from either this volume, or *Scribner's Magazine*, 20 (1896). Further references to this periodical will be given after quotations in the text marked by the appropriate volume number (XIX or XX).
- ⁷ Bradford A. Booth & Ernest Mehew, eds., *The Letters of Robert Louis Stevenson*, 7 vols. (London: Yale University Press, 1994-5), VII, p. 276. Written in a letter to Henry James dated erroneously 5 December 1891, because it was actually 1892, as James pointed out in his reply. Stevenson writes that he regards James, Barrie and Kipling as his 'Muses Three'.
- ⁸ Barrie had been involved in journalism during his time at Edinburgh University. In 1879 he began reviewing plays for *The Edinburgh Courant*, while studying for his M. A.
- ⁹ In *The Greenwood Hat*, Barrie explains, 'In dispatching that article he though he had exhausted the subject, but in no time thereafter he sent off 'An Auld Licht Funeral' (accepted), which led promptly to 'An Auld Licht Courtship' (accepted), and henceforth I tell you he was frequently at his loom weaving Auld Lichts', J. M. Barrie, *The Greenwood Hat being a Memoir of James Anon, 1885-1887* (London: Peter Davies, 1937), p. 7.
- ¹⁰ *The British Weekly* was edited by the Free Church minister William Robertson Nicoll, who held non-conformist views. The *Scots Observer* was set up 'by a group of wealthy Scottish Tories as a rival to the *Saturday Review*', but its circulation never rose above 2000. See John Gross, *The Rise and Fall of the English Man of Letters: Aspects of English Literary Life since 1800* (London: Penguin, 1991), pp. 216 & 153. McDonald describes the *Scots Observer*, along with the *New Review* as 'in effect, early modernist "little magazines" in mid-Victorian clothing', p. 50.
- ¹¹ Leslie Stephen, 'Authors for Hire', *The Cornhill Magazine*, 43 (1881), 684-702 (p. 689).
- ¹² Arthur C. Young, ed., *The Letters of George Gissing to Eduard Bertz, 1887-1903* (London: Constable, 1961), p. 140. Letter dated 16 December 1891, and Kipling and Hall Caine make up the other two.
- ¹³ 'Mr. Punch's Prize Novels', *Punch*, 99 (1890), 229 (p. 229).
- ¹⁴ Viola Meynell, *Letters of J. M. Barrie* (London: Peter Davies, 1942), p. v-vi.
- ¹⁵ Meynell, p. 5-6, Letter dated 3 January 1894.
- ¹⁶ *The Bookman*, 1 (1892), p. 159.
- ¹⁷ J. M. Barrie, 'Ndintpile Pont', *The Bookman*, 1 (1892) p. 173-4. Further references to this article in the text are taken from page 174. John Gross describes the pages of *The Bookman* as being full of 'Paternoster Row small talk' and

'exclusively devoted to the spirit of *belles lettres*'. The first issue sold over 15,000 copies, p. 217-8.

¹⁸ A typical example of the dubious suggestions is one inspired by the revelation that the journalist once fell into a pond. His friend's consequent conviction is that the editor is referring to that and wants to know what the sensation of drowning is like. The narrator finds this hard to accept, however, because, 'the editor does not know that I once fell into one, and besides I was not nearly drowned. It was a mere puddle of water, and I was quite surprised to learn afterwards that it was a pond'.

¹⁹ J. M. Barrie, *McConnachie and J. M. B.: Speeches by J. M. Barrie* (London: Peter Davies, 1938), p. vii.

²⁰ John Stokes, *In the Nineties* (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Press, 1989), p. 9. He quotes a similar attitude as portrayed in *Punch*, 108 (1895), p. 222. It is a poem entitled 'Philistine's Pæen' which ends with the lines, 'I know I'm relieved from a horrible bore - I need not admire what I hate anymore', p. 14.

²¹ Peter Keating, *The Haunted Study: A Social History of the English Novel, 1875-1914* (London: Martin Secker & Warburg, 1989), p. 298.

²² Barrie, *The Greenwood Hat*, p. 152-3. The example which Barrie uses is of an article in which a journalist had written so many articles on the Jubilee that 'when told to write another he retired to his study and shot himself'.

²³ Walpole, p. vii.

²⁴ H. G. A. Oppen Blowitz, 'Journalism as a Profession', *The Contemporary Review*, 63 (1893), 37-46 (p. 45).

²⁵ Keating, p. 84. See also Leone Ormond, *J. M. Barrie* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1987), p. 17, where she argues that Barrie 'regarded periodical journalism as a temporary interlude before devoting himself to serious writing'.

²⁶ Harry M. Geduld, *Sir James Barrie* (New York: Twayne, 1971), p. 15.

²⁷ Geduld, p. 19.

²⁸ J. M. Barrie, *Window in Thrums*, uniform edn. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1931), p. 39.

²⁹ Barrie, by setting it in a club, is also mocking the literary club scene. At the time of writing it would all have been relatively new to him but he was never to feel comfortable in them. In *The Greenwood Hat* he admits that 'Never [...] can there have been any one more unlike a club-man than I', p. 252.

³⁰ J. M. Barrie, 'Brought Back from Elysium', *Contemporary Review*, 57 (1890) 846-54 (p. 846-7). Further references to this article are given after the quotations in the text.

³¹ Ormond, p. 15.

³² Beinecke Library, Barrie Collection, A/3. Letter to Arthur Wing Pinero, dated 30 June 1910. Earlier in the letter he wrote, 'Think of it - there was a time when dramatists stayed at home, held their tongues and wrote their plays - now there's no time to write them, all occupied in writing about them (sic).' Denis McKail discusses the illustrations for *Tommy and Grizel* in *The Story of J. M. B.* (London: Peter Davies, 1941), p. 289.

³³ Meynell, p. 10, letter dated 21 November 1896.

³⁴ Meynell, p. 10, letter dated 21 November 1896.

³⁵ A. T. Quiller-Couch, 'Mr. Barrie's "Sentimental Tommy": A Causerie', *The Contemporary Review*, 70 (1896), 652-62 (p. 653 & 657).

³⁶ J. M. Barrie, *Sentimental Tommy: The Story of his Boyhood*, uniform edn. (London: Cassell, [1926?]), p. 288. Further references to this edition are given after quotations in the text marked ST.

³⁷ Keating, p. 77.

³⁸ Royal Cortissoz, 'Charles Scribner', in *Dictionary of American Biography*, ed. by Dumas Malone, 20 vols. (London: Oxford University Press, 1935), XVI (1935), 515-17 (p. 516).

³⁹ Holbrook Jackson, *The Eighteen Nineties: A Review of Art and Ideas at the Close of the Nineteenth Century* (London: Harvester Press, 1976), p. 103.

⁴⁰ Beinecke Library, Barrie Collection, A/3, Correspondence with Scribner's, letter to Edward Livermore Burlingame dated 26 January 1896.

⁴¹ Scribner's did issue an edition of *ST* complete with the illustrations, J. M. Barrie, *Sentimental Tommy: The Story of his Boyhood*, with illustrations by William Hatherell (New York: Charles Scribner's Son, 1896).

⁴² Ruth Robbins, ' "A Very Curious Construction": Masculinity and the Poetry of A. E. Houseman and Oscar Wilde', in *Cultural Politics at the Fin de Siècle*, ed. by Sally Ledger and Scott MacCracken (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 137-59 (p. 141).

⁴³ The relationship between Barrie and Scribner's for the publication of *ST* was mutually beneficial. The manuscript index to a letter book notes the relevant contract and sales. The contract is settled on 5 July 1895 in a letter to Barrie from Burlingame. Barrie received 10,000 American dollars, 7,500 for serial rights and a 2,500 advance on a 20% royalty. Such generous terms were justified when Burlingame sent royalty cheques to Barrie on 10 August 1897, stating that *ST* as a novel had sold 33,268 copies. Scribner's knew they had a prize in Barrie as early as May 1895, when Charles Scribner wrote to Burlingame suggesting that he 'tie up any future Barrie books if possible', Beinecke Library, Barrie Collection, A/3, Correspondence with Scribner's.

⁴⁴ John Tebbel, *A History of Book Publishing in the United States: The Expansion of an Industry, 1865-1919*, 4 vols. (London: R. R. Bowker, 1972-81), II (1975), p. 48.

⁴⁵ Cortissoz, p. 516.

⁴⁶ Keating, p. 227.

⁴⁷ [D. S. Meldrum], 'A New Boy In Fiction', *Blackwood's Magazine*, 60 (1896), 800-13 (p. 805).

⁴⁸ Unsigned, 'Sentimental Tommy, The Story of his Boyhood', *The Academy*, 50 (1896), 385 (p. 385). In this respect Barrie was profiting from the experience of Arthur Conan Doyle's Sherlock Holmes stories. As Peter McDonald also illustrates, Conan Doyle 'claimed that the idea of a "single character running through a series" of short stories struck him as an "ideal compromise" between the two staples of the magazine market - the serial and the "disconnected" short story, p. 138. He take his quote from Arthur Conan Doyle, *Memories and Adventures* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1924), p. 95-6.

⁴⁹ 'Sentimental Tommy, The Story of his Boyhood', p. 385

⁵⁰ This observation is a more positive way of interpreting the lack of narrative unity criticised by the *Church Quarterly Review*.

⁵¹ Within *The Greenwood Hat* earlier articles are republished which show incidents similar to those in *ST*. 'The Blue and White Room' pp. 138-42, naturally precedes Miss Ailie's room, although Barrie only seems to remember himself re-using it in *Quality Street*. In 'Old Hyphen', pp. 69-85 the embryo of Cathro and Tommy's relationship can be seen.

⁵² Burlingame had also written to Charles Scribner on 23 April 1895 that, having seen Barrie, he had found *ST* 'actually finished and now being cut down', Beinecke Library, Barrie Collection, A/3, Correspondence with Scribner's.

⁵³ Sir George Douglas, 'Mr. J. M. Barrie', *Good Words*, no vol. no. (1899), 200-03 (p. 203).

⁵⁴ J. M. Barrie, 'Mr Kipling's Stories', *Contemporary Review*, 59 (1891), 364-72 (p. 366).

⁵⁵ Douglas, p. 200.

⁵⁶ Sally Ledger, 'The New Woman and the Crisis of Victorianism', in *Cultural Politics*, 22-44 (p. 24).

⁵⁷ Harry Quilter, 'The Gospel of Intensity', *The Contemporary Review*, 67 (1895), 761-82 (pp. 763-4).

⁵⁸ Jackson, p. 40.

⁵⁹ Barrie, *The Greenwood Hat*, p. 180.

⁶⁰ Oscar Wilde, Preface to *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, ed. by Isobel Murray (London: Oxford University Press, 1974), p. xxxiii. Lack of author responsibility had already been condemned in the New Journalists by Barrie in 'Ndintpile Pont'.

⁶¹ J. M. Barrie, 'Mr Baring-Gould's Novels', *Contemporary Review*, 57 (1890), 206-14 (p. 208).

⁶² Barrie, 'Mr Baring-Gould's Novels', p. 207.

⁶³ Barrie, 'Mr Baring-Gould's Novels', p. 208.

⁶⁴ J. M. Barrie, 'Mr George Meredith's Novels', *Contemporary Review*, 54 (1888), 575-86 (p. 578).

⁶⁵ Beinecke Library, Barrie Collection, A/3, Correspondence with Scribner's, letter from Edward Livermore Burlingame, dated 22 October 1895.

⁶⁶ Beinecke Library, Barrie Collection, A/3, Correspondence with Scribner's, letter from Barrie, dated 31 October 1895. The extract taken from *Scribner's Magazine*, 19 (1896), p. 76, is cut from page 7 of the Uniform edition of Barrie's *Sentimental Tommy*. It follows the sentence beginning, 'When Tommy was wandering the streets': A linen rag, for the phlegm she brought up, was seldom out of her hands now, and she hung strings across the room, on which a score of them might be drying at a time. So many of these rags did she need that a new one was a valuable thing to her; she tore up pieces of linen, and even of wearing apparel, and still she had not sufficiency of rags. There came a time when to get a few of these rags was more vital to her than anything else in the world; they were all she asked for now, but she asked for too much. A face distorted with spasms of coughing, one hand pressing over a flat chest while the other hunted ever for rags - that was to be Elspeth's only memory of her mother, and through it the smell of cloths steaming.

⁶⁷ Beinecke Library, Barrie Collection, A/3, Correspondence with Scribner's, letter from Barrie, dated 5 April 1896.

⁶⁸ Thomas Hardy considers the dilemma faced by authors wishing to be true to their characters, or producing something contrary to their natures in order to placate external demands in 'Candour in English Fiction', *New Review*, 2 (1890), 15-21.

⁶⁹ Barrie, *The Greenwood Hat*, p. 1-2. Barrie writes, 'When I was a very small boy, another as small was woe-ful because he could not join in our rough play lest he damaged the "mourning blacks" in which he was attired. So I nobly exchanged clothing with him for an hour, and in mine he disported forgetfully while I sat on a stone in his and lamented with tears, though I knew not for whom'.

⁷⁰ J. M. Barrie, 'Thomas Hardy: The Historian of Wessex', *Contemporary Review*, 56 (1889), 57-66 (p. 58-60).

⁷¹ This is in agreement with Gorren's observation that good writing is not necessarily only about what is created, but about what is left out.

⁷² Barrie recognised that this 'sympathy' was not in vogue in the literary circles in 'Brought Back from Elysium'.

⁷³ A similar role is performed by Corp when Tommy arrives in Thrums. Corp strives to keep up with Tommy but his imagination is not as vivid. Thus he finds himself having difficulty imagining himself dragging himself off. Lynette Hunter, also, points out the function of Grizel as the realist in antithesis to Tommy, the

fantasist, in her article 'J. M. Barrie: The Rejection of Fantasy', *Scottish Literary Journal*, 5 (1978), 39-52 (p. 42).

⁷⁴ Meynell, p. 12, letter dated 11 December 1896. Abbreviated in F. Brittain, *Arthur Quiller-Couch, A Biographical Study of Q* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1947), p. 31.

⁷⁵ The use of the word eminence highlights one of the interesting changes between the serial and book publications. Chapter 36, which precedes this quote in the book is headed 'Of Four Ministers Who Afterwards Boasted That They Had Known Tommy Sandys', but the serial had read 'Four Eminent Ministers'. The change, in light of the quote, brings into question the impulses behind these religious men.

⁷⁶ Arnold Bennett had a similar attitude towards genius. He wrote in *The Author's Craft*, 'Occasionally, by chance, a genius may be so fortunately endowed that he captures the public at once, and the question of compromise never arises. But this is exceedingly rare', p. 109.

⁷⁷ J. M. Barrie, *An Edinburgh Eleven*, uniform edn. (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1931), p. 17.

⁷⁸ Geduld, p. 47.

⁷⁹ Geduld, p. 46.

⁸⁰ Thomas D. Knowles, *Ideology, Art and Commerce: Aspects of Literary Sociology in the Late Victorian Scottish Kailyard*, Gothenburg Studies in English 54 (Gothenburg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis, 1983), p. 87.

⁸¹ Stephen, p. 689.

⁸² Knowles, p. 23.

⁸³ McDonald, pp. 88 & 115.

⁸⁴ Barrie, *The Greenwood Hat*, p. 5.

CONCLUSION

Pierre Bourdieu admits that 'sociology and art do not make good bedfellows'.¹ This, he believes, is because sociology, by seeking to understand and account for what is found in the universe of art, offends the idea which artists have of themselves as unique, uncreated creators. Bourdieu's own theories of literary production appear to bear this out by denying the primacy of the author. A work is created not only by the writer, but by all the other agents within the literary field who produce its value. He perceives that 'the artist who makes the work is himself made, at the core of the field of production, by the whole ensemble of those who help to "discover" him and to consecrate him as an artist who is thus "known" and "recognized" - critics, writer of prefaces, dealers, etc.' (*Rules*, p. 167).

Accordingly, Bourdieu's conception of the cultural field includes everyone involved in the production of cultural goods and their value, yet I have concentrated primarily on the voices of the writers and their points of view within the field. In doing so, I am not trying to re-instate the ideology of the sole producer, but to consider him from this new, and seemingly demoted, position. Bourdieu should not offend the literary critic, rather he should be seen to offer a new and challenging framework within which to re-evaluate authors and their work. By highlighting the absence of any inherent authority for writers within their chosen field, he introduces the conflict over legitimacy within which they had to participate.

The texts considered here do not just signify an attempt by the authors to reclaim some power over their definitions within the field. This in itself, as Bourdieu explains, would be doomed to failure. Any effort on the part of the writer to control the reception of their work is futile because the 'very effect of their work may transform the conditions of its reception' (*Field*, p. 31). Rather, using the inspiration of Bourdieu's analysis of the cultural field, this thesis attempts to

illuminate what was happening in the literary field of the 1890s through a discussion of these selected authors and their writing. Therefore, fictional works are used as vehicles through which the conflicts within the field, which are seldom consciously documented because they are part of the 'self-evident givens of the situation', can be uncovered (*Field*, p. 31). And what has been revealed is a growing self-awareness among writers at this time of the conflict in which they found themselves; caught in the 'opposition between "commercial" and "non-commercial"' that reappears everywhere in the field (*Field*, p. 82).

Conscious of the demands of the new readership and mass production, each author was aware that the cost of popularity, and its consequent monetary reward, was likely to be the denial of literary prestige and reputation. But the depth of understanding of this conflict varied in each author, as did the degree to which it affected them. Therefore, Besant is content to service the demands of the reader, wishing to promote a dignity in mass production by futilely campaigning for the eradication of the 'economy reversed' within the field. James and Gissing are caught in the whirlpool, wanting and scorning popularity at one and the same time. It is left to Barrie to 'play the field' most successfully, by using his short-term success to modify his entrapment within the conflict; fulfilling reader expectations while simultaneously investing in the long-term rewards available only in the sub-field of restricted production.

Just as the field of the 1890s was a product of all the preceding literary fields, the field of the 1890s created the conditions for the field of the early twentieth century. The growing democratic, mass audience in the 1890s allowed for a parallel growth in autonomy within the literary field. This development continued so that by 1899 Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* could appear, a novel in which the author apparently ignored yet skilfully manipulated reader expectations. Later, Joyce and the modernists, by contrast, would seek to destroy the whole system. Therefore, the work here should not only illuminate the work of these individual

authors at this time, but should cast light on the development of the fields which followed.

In the process of using Bourdieu's theory, this work tries, concurrently, to define some of the major concepts behind Bourdieu's theories. The first chapter considers the basic conflict concerning legitimacy within the field of literary production. It introduces some of the new voices fighting for this legitimacy at the end of the nineteenth century, demonstrating their rôle in the production of the value of literary works. Gissing's *New Grub Street* is then shown to reveal the two principles of heirarchization within the field, as well as the dual economy discussed in Chapter Three. He presents the conflict that authors had to situate themselves within which also produced the artist in Barrie's *Sentimental Tommy*, an artist who defines himself against both extremes, epitomizing neither the sub-field of restricted, nor that of large-scale production.

In this work I have only fully considered one of the fundamental oppositions at the core of the field. I have looked only briefly at the opposition 'between the consecrated avant-garde and the avant-garde, the established figures and the newcomers, i.e. between *artistic generations*, often only a few years apart, between the "young" and the "old" [...] the "new" and the "outmoded"' (*Field*, p. 53). It is an opposition which Bourdieu places solely in the field of restricted production and I feel it is best illustrated by analysis of authors functioning at a time of greater autonomy. I have begun an initial re-positioning of Joyce, which considers this conflict, and although outwith the time period it has been included as an appendix to this work.

I chose to consider one manifestation of the conflict in the field; the effect and presence of the struggle for legitimization, and competing systems of valuation on authors in the field, embodied in their fictional representations of writers and the literary world. This opens up many new avenues for research, not only in the position of other primary creators, but in the analysis of booksellers, publishers

and editors as agents within a field of objective relations. Even the social trajectory of each of the writers considered here would be worthy of further study. Does Barrie's perception of the conflict change when in the position of a successful dramatist? Can producers of value in cultural products at the end of this century re-establish a belief in Besant? Additionally, no consideration has been attempted of the position of the chosen texts (which most explicitly join the struggle for legitimacy) against the authors' other writings, where the conflict may be more veiled.

As asserted in the introduction Bourdieu's interest lies in highlighting conflict which has hitherto passed unnoticed in the social system, not limiting his research to one particular field. In this way, his theories can be used by many different disciplines, in many different ways. Bridget Fowler reveals that Bourdieu's characteristic way of resolving the 'stalemates in academic social theory' is by refusing both positions, transcending 'the existing antinomies by pioneering a third alternative position'.² Within literary theory specifically, as both Randal Johnson and Peter McDonald have asserted, this expresses itself as a refreshing theory which rejects both 'internal' (e.g. structuralist) and 'external' (e.g. Marxist) modes of analysis as being insufficient in themselves.³ However, he himself is at an intermediate stage of consecration, with Fowler suggesting that even in his own field of sociology of culture he 'has not yet had the depth of attention he deserves'.⁴ Neither has Bourdieu achieved anything like dominance in the field of literary field. Here, too, more discussion lies ahead.

Endnotes: Conclusion

¹ Pierre Bourdieu, *Sociology in Question*, trans. by Richard Nice (London: SAGE Publications, 1993), p. 139.

² Bridget Fowler, *Pierre Bourdieu and Cultural Theory: Critical Perspectives* (London: SAGE Publications, 1997), p. 21 & 22.

³ Peter D. McDonald, *British Literary Culture and Publishing Practice, 1880-1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 172; Randal Johnson's introduction to *Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1993), 1-25 (p. 10-14).

⁴ Fowler, p. 7.

APPENDIX

Notes Towards a Positioning of James Joyce

Two fundamental conflicts underlie Pierre Bourdieu's field of cultural production. One is the opposition, based upon independent hierarchized principles of differentiation, between the sub-field of restricted production and the sub-field of large-scale production. The second is the opposition within the sub-field of restricted production, not between principles of valuation but between degrees of consecration (*Rules*, p. 121-2). This conflict, as Bourdieu explains, is between:

the consecrated avant-garde and the avant-garde, the established figures and the newcomers, i.e. between *artistic generations*, often only a few years apart, between the 'young' and the 'old' [. . .] the 'new' and the 'outmoded'

(*Field*, p. 53)

In *The Egoist* both Ezra Pound and Richard Aldington described this antagonism between the artists functioning in the sub-field of restricted production in the second decade of the twentieth century. Aldington noted that there was 'more acrimonious feeling between two artists of opposing theories' than there was 'between a Catholic Nationalist and a Protestant Orangeman'.¹ While Pound, a few articles later, looked back nostalgically to the way in which older novelists had appreciated each other, admitting that people 'do not know how much my friends detest each other' (*Egoist* I, p. 294). Such is the face of the modern artist struggling to survive in this sub-field; a sub-field which does not submit to the laws of competition but 'tends to develop its own criteria for the evaluation of its products' (*Field*, p. 115).

While popular authors had to define themselves against the field of large-scale production, James Joyce encountered the experience of the field of restricted production. A consideration of *The Egoist* magazine during its publication of

Joyce's *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man (Portrait)* between 1914 and 1915 provides an ideal opportunity to re-position Joyce within the field of restricted production and its particular conflicts.² The relationship between Joyce and *The Egoist* also serves as an example of the way in which the belief and value of a work or artist is produced by other position-holders in the field.

Those in the field of restricted production produce for other producers and for them the value of their work is not measured in capital terms. They seek recognition, and thus value, only from those whom they respect. Joyce's position in this sub-field was practically sealed when he agreed to publish *Portrait* in *The Egoist* at Ezra Pound's request. Pound's first letters to Joyce contained not only an introduction of himself, but an introduction to the type of periodical in which he could place Joyce's work. His letter of 15 December 1913 admitted that *The Egoist* 'practically can not pay at all, we do it for the larks and to have a place for markedly modern stuff'.³ In January of the next year he explained that it does not mind shocking people, it still cannot pay but 'one keeps it, as I said, for [~~cross-out~~: personal utterance, or] propaganda, or for stuff that is too personal to sell to the usual magazines, or too outspoken. We want it to be a place where a man can speak out'.⁴ Pound considered *The Egoist* and *The Cerebralist* as the 'only organs that stand for free speech and want [. . .] literature' and his opinion of other magazines was as damning as his opinion of *The Egoist* was glowing.⁵ Later, when approaching the Royal Literary Fund on Joyce's behalf, he complained that because the older magazines were 'so sunk in sloth and stupidity', it was 'impossible for anyone under ninety and unrelated to [. . .] detestable victorian (sic) rhetoricians to get published in them'.⁶ Therefore, Joyce could be in no doubt that his first novel was going to be seen initially in one of the 'little magazines'.

'Little magazines' were the Anglo-American equivalent of the periodicals launched by the French avant-garde movements to reach new recruits. These

publications were initially directed to a specific movement or audience and represented 'a reaction, as natural as it is necessary, to the spread of the culture out to (or down to) the vulgar' which many believed was the consequence of mass journalism.⁷ The main characteristic of these 'little magazines' was the 'noncommercial nature of their publishing',⁸ which created a degree of autonomy and complied with the reversed economic principles of the field of restricted production.⁹

To demonstrate the differences between a 'cultural business' and a 'commercial business', Bourdieu uses examples from the French publishing houses Editions de Minuit and Robert Laffont. The latter company is what he terms 'overtly success oriented', consciously seeking out best-sellers which carry out print runs of over 100,000 copies. Editions de Minuit, in contrast, is 'always loss-making', if considered only on the merit of its latest publications (*Field*, p. 99). It survives on its past investments, notably Samuel Beckett's *En attendant Godot*, which sold fewer than 200 copies in 1952, but by 1977 had sold over 500,000 copies. Therefore, different publishing houses can be characterised according to the 'share they give to the risky, long-term investments and to the sure, short-term investments and, by the same token, according to the proportion among their authors of writers for the long-term and writers for the short-term' (*Rules*, p. 143). On these criteria The Egoist Press was unquestionably a 'cultural business' with the 'lion-hearted Miss Weaver who printed Joyce when nobody else would' at its helm.¹⁰ Those in the cultural businesses of the sub-field of restricted production were willing to make a long term investment in the field rather than a 'quick-killing'.

The Egoist first appeared on the 23 December 1913, a reincarnation of the *New Freewoman*, which was itself the successor to the *Freewoman* which had begun in 1911. The *Freewoman* had been a feminist magazine edited by Dora Marsden, which with a new name and under the influence of John Gould Fletcher and Ezra

Pound extended its content to include fiction and philosophy. The result of such an inclusive editorial policy was that the title became incongruous and Pound wrote to the *New Freewoman* in 1913 asking Marsden to 'consider the advisability of adopting another title which will mark the character of your paper as an organ of the individuals of both sexes'.¹¹ Consequently, *The Egoist, An Individualist Review* was born. Marsden was the editor for the first six months until domestic pressures forced her resignation, after which she remained heavily involved as a contributing editor, continuing to write the leading articles on philosophical debates. The post of editor was handed to Harriet Shaw Weaver, who had become financially involved after the collapse of the *Freewoman*. This was an important development because it was her money which would allow *The Egoist* to survive despite its 'uncommercial' nature.

The Egoist Press Ltd.¹² functioned on the reversed economic principles abundant in the sub-field of restricted production. The publishing history of *The Egoist* shows that its advanced nature prevented it from paying its way, having to rely instead upon heavy subsidising from Weaver. In 1915 she introduced an economy drive because the previous six months trading had cost the company £337 and had brought in just £37. The result was that *The Egoist* began to appear monthly instead of fortnightly and the print run was reduced from 1000 to 750 copies. This reduction was still overly generous when it is considered that by 1916 the circulation was still only 200 copies per issue.¹³ Weaver, and those about her, belonged to a group, characterised by its attempt 'to accumulate specifically cultural capital, albeit at the cost of temporarily renouncing economic profit', identifying them, accordingly, as 'cultural entrepreneurs', who occupied a high risk position in the literary field (*Field*, p.83). It was fortunate for Pound, Marsden and Joyce that they found a kindred spirit in Weaver who had inherited part of her maternal grandfather's fortune on her mother's death in 1909. The money left her

financially independent and enabled her and her magazine to exist in this non-profitable position in relative comfort.

Weaver, through her association with *The Egoist*, was to become indispensable in the early development and continuation of Joyce's publications and her initial interest shows that she never envisaged any financial rewards. She first heard of Joyce in the pages of her own magazine. On 15 January 1914 Pound printed a letter which Joyce had sent to periodicals two years earlier which detailed the problems he was experiencing in obtaining a publisher for his collection of stories, *Dubliners*. Jane Lidderdale and Mary Nicholson surmise Weaver's reaction:

It is not difficult to imagine the effect on Harriet of this 'statement'. Here, clearly, was an author to whom the right of publication had been denied. Although, for the time being she was not personally involved in redressing the injustice, her imagination and her sympathies were engaged on his behalf and prepared her for taking up his cause as soon as the opportunity for action came.¹⁴

Weaver did not believe that the right of publication should be denied on grounds of censorship or lack of economic viability, but rather, that a work should be judged on its artistic or literary merit; that is, on its symbolic value. With an editor who combined such radical thought with financial independence, *The Egoist* found itself at the forefront of art in the 1910s.¹⁵

***The Egoist* and the Avant-Garde**

Being serialised in *The Egoist* placed Joyce and his work not only in the sub-field of restricted production, but in the extreme position within it occupied by the avant-garde. As Randal Johnson suggests it is unsurprising to see the avant-garde movement situated in this extreme position within the sub-field, the logic of which makes it the ideal place for experimentation.¹⁶ The emergent mass media of the late nineteenth century had shown no signs of abating by the time Joyce was writing,

rather it was welcoming new developments, expanding, not only in printing, but through film and photography. Furthermore, it was this 'era of commercial and industrial art' which gave rise to the 'epoch of avant-garde art', each situated at opposite extremes of the field of cultural production.¹⁷

Raymond Williams in his discussion of the emergence of Modernism isolates three main phases which had been developing in the literary world since the late nineteenth century:

Initially, there were innovative groups which sought to protect their practices within the growing dominance of the art market and against the indifference of the formal academies. These developed into alternative, more radically innovative groupings, seeking to provide their own facilities of production, distribution and publicity; and finally into fully oppositional formations, determined not only to promote their own work but to attack its enemies in the cultural establishment.¹⁸

Looked at from Bourdieu's perspective, Williams does not describes three parts of one phase, but a series of new positions entering the field of restricted production from the 1890s, culminating with the avant-garde. Each of the above groups arose, not only out of a shared opposition to the growing commercialism of art, but also out of conflict with the preceding faction, each threatening the others for dominance. It reflects the conflict between the consecrated avant-garde and the avant-garde, whereby consecration eventually leads to new challengers for the position.

It was in France in the 1870s that the term 'avant-garde' began to take on a cultural-artistic meaning, alongside its political one. The military term from which it originates explains what these new avant-garde artists initially sought to achieve:

Within the military connotations of the image, the implication is not so much an advance on the enemy as a marching toward, a reconnoitring or exploring of, that difficult and unknown territory called no-man's land.¹⁹

These artists stood for the future of art, rather than the past and Renato Poggiolo defines four aspects of avant-garde movements. One is the activism illustrated above, which is the joy found in action for its own sake. Most frequently though, avant-garde movements are based on the second aspect, antagonism, whereby the movement agitates *against* something. This is where the conflict in the sub-field occurs because this 'something' is often the tradition, or the artists or teachers which have gone before; those already with various degrees of consecration anywhere in the field as a whole. In Poggioli's opinion, these are the two rational aspects of the avant-garde which can develop into the two irrational elements. Activism in the extreme becomes nihilism, which seeks to destroy all barriers and obstacles which get in its way, while not necessarily expecting to achieve anything. In Marsden's philosophical leaders a similar development in attitude can be found. In March 1914 her 'Views and Comments' column reflects a degree of activism:

For nowadays it is counted as being not merely *worthy* to be an agitator: since Oscar Wilde let the mark of intelligence rest on this label, it has become the only smart thing, so much so that not to agitate and be agitated is to be guilty of immoral conduct of the worst brand: to be dowdy, to wit.

(*Egoist* I, p. 103)

By February of the following year, her summary of the outlook of the magazine's contributors indicates more destructive, and therefore nihilistic, tendencies:

We are not people engaged in soul-saving, either after the egoistic or altruistic manner. We are not opposers of fence-erecting, nor desirous of dragging down fences except those which stand between us and whatever we choose to want. Such fences as are in our interest we endeavour to get set up.

(*Egoist* II, p. 19)

The fourth and final aspect in Poggioli's list is agonism, by which he means that avant-garde movements welcome and accept self-ruin as 'an obscure or unknown sacrifice to the success of future movements'.²⁰

The mass journalists tended, naturally, to emphasise the ephemerality and strangeness of the avant-garde art, but they tried to define it further:

there had to be leaders and followers, rivalries, defections, and then new leaders and new followers [. . .]. Suddenly artists became old veterans or new recruits, and they were expected to 'fight for' some ism that could be reduced to a simple common denominator like the cube or the vortex.²¹

It is Joyce's appearance in *The Egoist* which unwittingly portrayed him to the readers as a new recruit for the 'isms' consecrated within its pages.

Poggioli describes the typical avant-garde reviews:

Sometimes the goal of the little review is merely to publish proclamations and programs or a series of manifestos, announcing the foundation of a new movement, explicating and elaborating its doctrine categorically and polemically. Or else they merely present to a friendly or hostile public an anthology of the collective work in a new tendency or by a new group of artists and writers.²²

The Egoist was slightly different because it was an existing magazine which was used by its contributors to promote different movements at different times. The person who used the magazine most effectively was Pound, who, as he had admitted to Joyce, used it blatantly for propaganda.

Ezra Pound had been in the ranks of *The Egoist* since its days as the *New Freewoman*. He had been enlisted by Rebecca West, as part of her effort to change the emphasis of the magazine from suffragism to literature.²³ Ellmann describes him at this time as 'the most active man in London. Full of contempt for the world of contemporary writing, he had made himself its strident reformer'.²⁴ His initial enthusiasm saw him working to promote the works of a group of young poets called the Imagists and searching for 'an exclusive English outlet' in which to publish them.²⁵ West and Pound saw the mutual advantages of an alliance.

Pound contributed literary reviews as well as providing and paying for original poems from his Imagist group. In October 1913 West resigned and Richard

Aldington, an Imagist poet and regular contributor, found himself in the position of sub-editor. Thus as Louis MacKendrick suggests 'before Eliot joined the *Egoist* [in 1917] it had been a primarily Imagist vehicle'.²⁶ Imagism was to be neither Pound's nor *The Egoist*'s only allegiance during the time that *Portrait* was serialised though. Aldington remained to fight the Imagist corner, but by 1914 Pound had already become disillusioned by the literary group, developing a greater interest in the visual arts. It was during *Portrait*'s serialisation in *The Egoist* that Pound turned from Imagism to Vorticism and at the same time distanced himself from the primary avant-garde movement, Italian Futurism. These three movements represent groups within the sub-field of restricted production with varying levels of consecration. Futurism was fully consecrated taking a dominant position within the avant-garde, Imagism was gaining recognition and Vorticism was making its first appearance. This indicates the internal propaganda and conflict into which James Joyce's first novel was launched.

The '-isms' of *The Egoist*: Imagism, Vorticism and Futurism

Avant-garde movements wanted consecration and they sought it in two ways. First, they placed their ideas and work before the public, promoting it through little magazines, manifestos, anthologies or exhibitions in an attempt to get their work recognised. Second, they sought further definition for their individual groups by explicitly distancing themselves from others functioning in the field of literary production. While on the one hand the movements at this time were united in distancing themselves from those working within the field of large-scale production, it was just as important to separate themselves from other avant-garde movements. The avant-garde propounded revolution but when a particular group achieved consecration it was inevitable that it then had an interest in retaining the new status quo. Each new avant-garde movement had to challenge not only the

popular novelists, the new journalists and the schools, but the avant-garde movements which had gone before them. Even within avant-garde groups conflict would eventually arise, as shown by Pound and the Imagists. Bourdieu explains such 'dominated groups, whose unity is essentially oppositional, tend to fly apart when they achieve recognition', having thus become dominant themselves (*Field*, p. 66).

The Imagist movement was a literary and specifically poetic movement comprising of American and British poets. 1914 not only witnessed the publication of the first of its three anthologies, *Des Imagistes*, but the departure of Pound from the movement that he had named. In *The Egoist*, F. S. Flint describes 'The History of Imagism' from its origins in T. E. Hulme's The Poet's Club, which existed from 1908 until 1909. Flint explains that the poets were united by a 'dissatisfaction with English Poetry as it was then (and is still, alas!) being written' (*Egoist* II, p. 71), emphasising immediately its reactionary aspect. In 1912 Pound breathed new life into the ideas which Hulme and Flint had enthused over: vers libre; the Image; rhymeless poems. At the end of his book, *Ripostes*, he published the poems of Hulme and started to recruit poets for his movement starting with Hilda Doolittle (H. D.) and Richard Aldington. Peter Jones writes that these two were as surprised as the next man when Pound told them at one of their tea-shop meetings that they were Imagistes.²⁷ Pound now had a movement with a name and followers, and in March 1913 the first tentative steps towards a manifesto were made. Published in that issue of *Poetry*, an American little magazine edited by Harriet Moore, were 'Imagisme' by Flint and 'A Few Don'ts by an Imagiste' by Pound.²⁸ Pound, however, was to distance himself from the movement after its first publication, and the second anthology *Some Imagist Poets* came out in 1915 under the direction of Amy Lowell.

The Egoist performed the rôle of an avant-garde review for Imagism by both explaining its doctrine and presenting its work, to the extent that the poems of the Imagists became a main feature in the magazine.²⁹ The readers were given an insight into what Imagism was and, therefore, a method of appreciating their poems. The times when *The Egoist* published such explications naturally coincided with the publication of the anthologies for optimum exposure. On 1 June 1914 Aldington reviewed *Des Imagistes* in 'Modern Poetry and the Imagists'. Admitting that being included in the anthology himself should preclude him from writing such a review he nevertheless feels he should 'try and explain the aims and common sympathies and theories which have bound us together' (*Egoist* I, p. 202).³⁰ His confession highlights the fact that in avant-garde reviews consecration is normally given by the avant-garde agitators themselves.

The next month in *The Little Review*, Charles Ashleigh recall that Aldington had believed that five of the poets included in the *Des Imagistes* were not Imagists. One of those cited was Joyce.³¹ Joyce's 'I Hear an Army', a poem which had already been published in Joyce's collection entitled *Chamber Music* (1907), had appeared in the anthology. Aldington, however, was right in his judgement. Joyce was not an Imagist, nor did he pretend to be one. J. B. Harmer concludes that 'Joyce was uninterested in the Imagistes, as he was in anything save the development of his own work'.³² It is paradoxical, but typical of Pound's capacity to change, that it was Pound, who having thus appropriated Joyce for the Imagist group, was later to praise him for not belonging to 'any school at all'.³³

In May 1915 a special Imagist number of *The Egoist* was published to coincide with the publication of *Some Imagist Poets*. It included the work of principal Imagists, incorporating some of John Gould Fletcher's prose and reviews of the poets by the poets, again presenting self-consecration.³⁴ In fact, if *The Egoist* was the only publication received in a household, the recipients could be excused for

believing that the Imagist poets were the only ones writing new poetry in Britain, a view which the Imagists would doubtless have been happy to perpetuate. Therein was also the history of Imagism by Flint which brought the movement up to date by revealing that since the 1914 publication 'Mr. Ezra Pound had become a "Vorticist" ' (*Egoist* II, p. 71).³⁵

Pound used *The Egoist* for similar propaganda and consecration of Vorticism, a short-lived movement whose most important year was 1914/15, coinciding with the serialisation of *Portrait*. *The Egoist* follows the movement through its stages of consecration, from its initial steps when it had not yet defined itself, to full definition with the launch of its own magazine, *Blast*, and the beginning of its end with the war and the resultant death in Ypres of Henri Gaudier-Bzreska. Like the poems of the Imagists, the sculptures and paintings of the primary participants of Vorticism were constantly brought to the reader's attention, explained and praised. Pound describes the movement's motivation as creating a 'movement of individuals, for individuals, for the protection of individuality' (*Egoist* I, p. 306). He also justifies the use of propaganda and self-consecration by writing that, 'when one sees some form of beauty attacked, some beautiful form incomprehended, one takes up its defence, automatically almost. It is natural to praise and defend those who have given us pleasure' (*Egoist* I, p. 307). Those in the field of restricted production feel the need to explain and justify their art, not only because it does not fulfil the normal economic standards indicative of success, but because they do not believe that the average person is capable of understanding it.

In February 1913, even before they had formally defined themselves as Vorticists, Pound was praising the work of Edward Wadsworth and Jacob Epstein in *The Egoist*. In a discussion on 'The New Sculpture', he asserts that Epstein was 'the only sculptor in England' because his work reflected the strife felt in the arts of

the moment (*Egoist* I, p. 68). He also introduces the name of Henri Gaudier-Brzeska, a young talent whose sculptures and drawings were reproduced at the end of the issue.³⁶

Pound's consecration of the new and unnamed movement continues in a review of an Exhibition at the Goupi Gallery. Again, admiring the new art of Epstein and Gaudier-Brzeska, he asserts that their sculptures are 'great art because they are sufficient in themselves' (*Egoist* I, p. 109). Later, Wyndham Lewis gets the 'Pound treatment' and becomes 'one of the greatest masters of design yet born in the occident' (*Egoist* I, p. 233). The praise continues:

I mean that Mr. Lewis has got into his work something which I recognise as the voice of my own age, an age which has not come into its own, which is different from any other age which has yet expressed itself intensely. We are not *les jeunes* of 'the thirties' nor of 'the nineties' nor of any other decade save our own. And we have in Mr. Lewis our most articulate voice.

(*Egoist* I, p. 234)

Significance is placed on the complete separation of this movement from any other which has gone before it, situating it in conflict with every position in the field.

It was the trinity of Pound, Lewis and Gaudier-Brzeska which was to give Vorticism its distinctive voice. In April 1914 *The Egoist* carried a full-page advertisement for a new periodical edited by Wyndham Lewis called *Blast*, which was to contain the 'last of the major manifestos, that of the Great London Vortex'.³⁷ The advert promised 'Discussion of Cubism, Futurism, Imagisme and all Vital Forms of Modern Art' (*Egoist* I, p. 160), which for a publication which was to be the voice of Vorticism, seems to have one glaring omission. Vorticism was not included because it was not until May or June that Pound and Lewis decided upon a word which could distinguish their art from the other movements.³⁸ It was then only a short time before the first issue came out on 2 July 1914. Naturally, the new little magazine was reviewed favourably by Aldington in *The Egoist*.

In Aldington's review of the 'huge pink' periodical, he explains that the movement is 'an effort to look at art from an Anglo-Saxon point of view instead of from a foreign standpoint' and represents the 'new, vigorous art in England' (*Egoist* I, pp. 248 & 272). The *Blast* manifesto, and hence the movement, was far more extreme in its avant-garde tendencies than Imagism. As William C. Wees reveals that, 'in keeping with the avant-garde spirit of the day, *Blast* intended to shock. Not only its name, but its cover, its size, and typography worked to that end'.³⁹ Inside its pages the Vorticists cursed and blasted all that they disagreed with, ending with a list of people under either the heading 'BLAST' or 'BLESS'.⁴⁰ Again, Joyce is linked with a new group of agitators more explicitly than providing a mere paratext for their propaganda in *The Egoist*. Joyce is claimed as one of their own, named in the list of those blessed.

The Vorticist movement was short-lived and the periodical was to have only one more issue. Harmer places some of the blame, at least, on timing. The war, he argues, did not prevent them 'from gaining popular acceptance (of that there was little danger), but from injecting their work with their full imaginative energy'.⁴¹ The effect of the war on art was reflected in *The Egoist* most tellingly in the obituaries of Gaudier-Brzeska which appeared in the August and September issues of 1915 written by John Cournos. The emphasis is on the loss of a great artist. Cournos finds it hard to accept that 'a man so gifted with genius, so abundantly endowed with aliveness, should come upon our earth merely to die by a bullet - his work undone, his creative secret untold' (*Egoist* II, p.121). He concludes that 'many "masters" of to-day are really disciples in soul. They imitate the real masters and deny them at the same time. It is, therefore, inexpressibly sad when a man like Brzeska is lost to us for Brzeska had in him the makings of a master' (*Egoist* II, p.138).⁴²

Thus, *The Egoist* aligned itself with the avant-garde movements of Imagism and Vorticism. However, as important as standing *for* something was standing *against* something and accordingly, conflict within the avant-garde community was rife. With all these '-isms' appearing and disappearing, each movement had to differentiate itself from existing ones in the fight to survive and gain a dominant position within the field. The stance against a movement in *The Egoist* is not as prominent as the propaganda in favour, but it is clear that Pound, for one, chose this time to distance himself publicly from Italian Futurism.

Futurism was in many respects the founder of the modern avant-garde movements. Under the leadership of Filippo Marinetti, the movement paved the way in propaganda techniques by using the press to its advantage in an unprecedented way. It was the Futurist manifestos which instigated the others, the first appearing in *Le Figaro* in February 1909. The manifesto can be read as 'a broad statement of general dissatisfaction with the state of affairs in poetry, as well as in the other arts'.⁴⁸ Point two of the manifesto declares that courage, audacity and revolt will be the main elements of their poetry, point four declares that the splendour of the world has been enriched by the new beauty possessed by speed and point nine, that they will glorify war. This initial manifesto was followed by separate manifestos for the other arts, the first being the Manifesto of Futurist Painting which appeared in February 1911.

Lewis describes Futurism as a movement of 'the Present with the Past rigidly excluded', influenced by H. G. Wells's idea 'of the dance of monstrous arrogant machinery, to the frenzied clapping of men's hands' (*Egoist* I, p. 8). However, like Weaver's relationship with *The Egoist*, the Futurist movement survived not only because of Marinetti's personality but because of his resources. Marinetti was 'a rich man without whose capital and publicity genius most of the innumerable

publications and other enterprises would not have been possible' due to the non-profitable position his movement held in the field of restricted production.⁴⁴

As Vorticism (like Imagism) shared common ground with Futurism, its proponents felt compelled to distance themselves publicly from the more dominant movement in order to safeguard their own autonomy.⁴⁵ This was again undertaken in the pages of *The Egoist*. The initial distancing was placed within their own propaganda. Lewis, while reviewing the Cubist Room exhibition, suggests that 'futurism will never mean anything else, in painting, than the Art practised by the five or six Italian painters grouped beneath Marinetti's influence' (*Egoist* I, p. 8-9). It was not until the correspondence pages in June that a direct disavowal was finally made:

We the undersigned, whose ideals were mentioned or implied, or who might by the opinions of others be implicated, beg to dissociate ourselves from the 'futurist' manifesto which appeared in the pages of the 'Observer' of Sunday June 7th.

Footnote- The direction of the Rebel Art Centre wishes to state that the use of their address by Sig. Marinetti and Mr. Nevinson was unauthorised.

(*Egoist* I, p. 239)

The list of signatories included Aldington, Gaudier-Brzeska, Lewis and Pound.

The manifesto mentioned in the disavowal was the Futurists' first one directed specifically against English art entitled 'Vital English Art'. It called for the glorification of Epstein, Wadsworth and Lewis claiming them, implicitly, as Futurists. For artists already beginning to feel oppressed by their constant association with Futurism this provided them with the perfect opportunity to reject it publicly. Not only Pound's groups, but the English avant-garde in general 'did not want to share the limelight with a foreign movement or a charismatic leader'.⁴⁶ For the Vorticist movement it could not have been timed better for *Blast* was just about to hit the streets.

Contributors, and especially Pound used *The Egoist* to define their avant-garde allegiances both through positive and negative consecration. It allowed them space to explain and demonstrate their new theories of art to an already friendly audience, or at least to an audience receptive to change and revolution. It was this readership which witnessed *Portrait* as a paratext to these avant-garde debates. It also revealed that Pound was not wholly selfish in his promotion of new art, because in the same way that he pushed for the recognition of Imagism and Vorticism, Pound set about creating a belief in Joyce within the pages of *The Egoist*. Joyce was to be an avant-garde movement in himself.

Joyce's Consecration: Ezra Pound and Harriet Shaw Weaver

In a letter written in response to an American publisher asking for some 'biographical items' in 1916, Joyce recognised the work which both Weaver and Pound had undertaken on his behalf:

Mr Pound wrote to me in Trieste in 1913, offering me his help. He brought the MSS of the novel to *The Egoist* where it was published serially (from February 1914 to September 1915). He also arranged for the publication in America and England. He has written many articles (all most friendly and appreciative) about me in English and American papers. But for his friendly help and the enterprise of Miss Weaver, editor of *The Egoist*, in accepting *A Portrait of the Artist* after it had been refused by all publishers, my novel would still be unpublished.⁴⁷

The relationship between these three individuals demonstrates how a reputation can be constructed and hints at the reliance an author has upon other position-holders within the field. Throughout his life Joyce was given financial help from various sources, a distinct advantage for survival in the sub-field of restricted production where commercial success is not immediate and sometimes only posthumous. In 1917 Weaver made an anonymous grant to Joyce of £50 each quarter and renewed her generosity in 1919 and 1920, while Pound canvassed his

literary friends to petition the Royal Literary Fund. He enlisted the help of Yeats and H. G. Wells to make the initial approaches to the Fund on Joyce's behalf. He felt that any bid by him would be less likely to succeed because of his association with the avant-garde literary groups, itself a manifestation of the conflict between the two sub-fields. The approach was successful and in 1915 Joyce received £75. The next year he was granted a £100 Civil List pension, again as a result of Pound's campaigning.⁴⁸ However necessary this money was to Joyce and his family's survival, Joyce wanted first and foremost that his work be read and noticed.⁴⁹ It was the building of his reputation which Pound and Weaver, together, conspired to do. Between them they could get Joyce published and his name known: they could produce his value.

In Bourdieu's field of cultural production 'for the author, the critic, the art dealer, the publisher or the theatre manager, the only legitimate accumulation consists in making a name for oneself, a known, recognized name, a capital of consecration implying a power to consecrate objects' (*Field*, p. 75). The question which Bourdieu asks is 'what authorizes the author, what creates the authority with which authors authorize'; 'Who creates the "creator"?' (*Field*, p.76), or who produces the belief in, and hence the value of, an author? Joyce's experiences epitomise the way in which it is not only the author who generates the value of a piece of work but the critic and the publisher. Bourdieu calls these creators of belief 'cultural businessmen', who by placing a new work on the market 'by exhibiting, publishing or staging it consecrates a product which [they have] discovered and which would otherwise remain a mere natural resource; and the more consecrated [they] personally [are], the more strongly [they] consecrate the work' (*Field*, p. 76-7).

The critics and publishers of James Joyce took very active and personal rôles in producing his initial recognition. Pound plays down his power of consecration as a critic in one of his reviews of Joyce, deeming his 'credit as a critic is

insufficient' to send intelligent readers out to buy *Dubliners*. However, it is undeniable that within the sub-field of restricted production at this time Pound did have the power to consecrate new avant-garde writers. If, as Bourdieu suggests, entering the field of literature 'is not so much like going into religion as getting into a select club' (*Field*, p. 77) then Pound held the door key. He undertook, along with Weaver, to see that Joyce was not only published, but positively consecrated and able to maintain a position of disavowal in the field of restricted production.⁵⁰ In order to achieve this, as he had done with his own art movements, Pound turned to *The Egoist*.

Pound's task, like the propaganda for the avant-garde movements, was twofold. The first aim was to get Joyce's work before an audience, the second to create a belief in him. His first letters to Joyce resulted in the publication of 'I Hear an Army' in *Des Imagistes* and the serialisation of *Portrait* in *The Egoist*. Joyce started to make the final corrections to his uncompleted novel as soon as he received Pound's letter requesting more examples of his work, and sent it to him for approval. *Portrait* was initially accepted for *The Egoist* by Marsden, although she reportedly did not actually read it at this stage.⁵¹ Later, as Ellmann suggests, 'Harriet Shaw Weaver was to complete what Pound began for Joyce'.⁵²

It was Weaver who set herself against, first, the printers of her periodical and then against each British publisher approached, in order to see that *Portrait* was published unabridged. Joyce may have been excused for thinking he would not experience the same trouble having it published in book form which he had had with *Dubliners*. This, however, was not to be. While the book was published in December 1916 in America, Harriet Shaw Weaver eventually had to publish the book herself, from imported sheets from the American publisher, B. W. Huebsch, having been unable to find a British printer willing to accept it. Therefore,

although *Portrait* finished its serialisation in 1915, the first British edition, of 750 copies, was not published until 12 February 1917.

Problems concerning publication had first arisen during its serialisation. The version which appeared in *The Egoist* had been censored, something which Weaver did not want to be repeated in the book production. On each occasion that censorship of the serial occurred, it had happened at the hands of the printer, not the editor. For the eleventh instalment Weaver had employed new printers who, without her knowledge, replaced Joyce's dashes with inverted commas. This was amicably rectified for the next instalment but was only the start of a mutilation of the text, a text which above all Weaver wanted to protect.⁵³ Therefore, Pound explained to Joyce that in the search for a publisher Weaver had sent Marshall 'the passages that the printer here had cut out, so he had the whole thing to judge by'.⁵⁴

Throughout the serial's run Weaver tried to stop the printers censoring the text. The first section to be omitted, at the insistence of her printer, Partridge and Cooper Ltd., was the second paragraph and the following piece of dialogue in Chapter 3. Her strong protest fell on deaf ears, a situation repeated when she offered them Chapter 4 and 5. In her continual attempt to see Joyce's text appear uncorrupted, she changed printers in December 1914 to Ballantyne's, but not before two sentences of the epiphany scene at the end of Chapter 4 had been omitted from the first number of *The Egoist*'s second volume. The final battle was about the words 'fart' and 'ballocks' in the penultimate instalment which were finally reduced to asterisks.

Publishers were reticent to publish the novel, because, as one reviewer pointed out, once it had eventually been published, 'it is not the kind of book of which the ordinary subscriber to Mudie's is likely to approve'.⁵⁵ Although Mudie was no longer the dominant defining voice he had once been, this still reflects not only the content of the book but its lack of obvious commercial appeal. Joyce was tackling subjects which were not generally discussed, let alone published.⁵⁶

When, in 1917, *Portrait* eventually appeared in book form, as a result of work put in by Pound and Weaver, it received mixed reviews. Naturally, *The Egoist* reviewer, Pound, stood by Joyce as he had done previously. For the February issue of that year Pound wrote the review, 'James Joyce, At Last The Novel Appears'. It not only reviewed the book but criticised the problems of publication, reflecting the antagonism which those united in the sub-field of restricted production felt towards those in the larger, economically dominant sub-field:

After much difficulty THE EGOIST itself turns publisher and produces *A Portrait of the Artist* as a volume, for the hatred of ordinary English publishers for good prose is, like the hatred of the *Quarterly Review* for good poetry, deep-rooted, traditional.

(*Egoist* IV, p. 21)

Portrait did not have the potential to be immediately popular. It did not aim at the masses. Thus, Pound argues that no 'manuscript has met with so much opposition, and no manuscript has been more worth supporting' (*Egoist* IV, p. 21).

This article demonstrates that Weaver and Pound could offer more than just money or publication; they could offer a self-perpetuating propaganda machine for Joyce within the pages of *The Egoist*. As well as publishing Joyce, *The Egoist* set about selling him to the audience. This represented the second aim; positive consecration through critical discourse. Any discourse on a work of art does not merely perform the task of encouraging appreciation and understanding, but is a 'moment which is part of the production of the work, of its meaning and its value' (*Rules*, p. 170). The amount of exposure which Pound gave to Joyce in the early years of *The Egoist* is highlighted in November 1916. After many months of discussion, Joyce's *Portrait* was about to be published by the Egoist Press, and Weaver approached Pound in the hope that he would write an article for *The Egoist* to stimulate interest. On 16 November he replied that, 'Of course I am ready to do an article or a preface BUT I think I have written so much about him

that it would be much more advantageous to have some other critic turned loose' and therefore asked that 'other methods be explored before *The Egoist* readers had to hear 'any more me on Joyce'".⁵⁷ As Bourdieu explains:

The production of discourse (critical, historical, etc.) about the work of art is one of the conditions of the production of the work. Every critical affirmation contains, on the one hand, a recognition of the value of the work which occasions it, which is thus designated as a worthy object of legitimate discourse [. . .] and on the other hand an affirmation of its own legitimacy.

(Field, p. 35-6)

Pound, in the pages of Weaver's magazine, produced discourse about, and a consequent value in, the work of Joyce, making *The Egoist* the launch pad for Joyce's literary success. Moreover, Pound's constant consecration of Joyce served to further legitimise his own position as a defining voice in the field.

The Egoist did more than merely publish Joyce's first novel, it stimulated interest in Joyce himself and his other works. This began before the first instalment in the article which had initially drawn Joyce to Weaver's attention, 'A Curious History'.⁵⁸ It was a copy of a letter which Joyce had sent to Irish newspapers in 1911 concerning the problematic publishing of *Dubliners*, which he had passed on to Pound in order to illustrate his current situation. Pound published it in the second issue of *The Egoist* on 15 January 1914 in his first public attempt to 'stir up interest' in the author of the magazine's new serial, an interest that would be of mutual benefit to both Joyce and the magazine.⁵⁹ Pound added no commentary to the letter, but had successfully introduced Joyce to the reader as an artist struggling for deserved recognition in the sub-field of restricted production.

Joyce felt his position strengthened by his association with, or consecration by, *The Egoist* and used it to exert further pressure on his hitherto intransigent publisher, Grant Richards.⁶⁰ *Dubliners* was published, finally, by Richards on 15 June 1914 in a run of 1250 copies. Five months later on 1 July, alongside the

eleventh instalment of *Portrait*, is a critical essay on Joyce by Pound. In a predictably favourable review of *Dubliners*, he compares Joyce to the French impressionist writers whom he admired, Stendhal and Flaubert. Careful to distinguish the type of impressionist writing which tries to write as Monet paints from the type intent on exact presentation, he does not find Joyce failing:

Joyce's merit [. . .] is that he carefully avoids telling you alot which you do not want to know. He presents his people swiftly and vividly, he does not sentimentalise over them, he does not weave convolutions. He is a realist. He does not believe 'life' would be all right if we stopped vivisection or if we instituted a new sort of 'economics.' He gives the thing as it is.

(*Egoist* I, p. 267)

He also brings in the point that to a great extent the readers of *The Egoist* were, if anyone was, already converted to the writings of Joyce. Demonstrating the self-legitimising aspects of discourse which Bourdieu highlights, Pound writes that 'the readers of THE EGOIST, having had Mr. Joyce under their eyes for some months, will scarcely need to have his qualities pointed out to them' (*Egoist* I, p. 267). That is, nonetheless, what Pound proceeds to do. The readership of *The Egoist* were fed avant-garde ideas all the time, but Pound still feels the need to explain explicitly *why* Joyce should be appreciated, constantly re-iterating the values of both Joyce, and himself. He flatters the readers by implying that they have the superior taste and intellect which he has, but assumes the reverse. This select audience needs to be sold Joyce before he can be sold to anyone else.

Even after the serialisation was complete, articles calculated to keep the reader's interest in Joyce alive continued to appear in *The Egoist* of this period. In February 1917 Pound's review of *Portrait* appears. Pound compares him favourably with Flaubert again, describing his writing as 'hard, clear-cut, with no waste of words, no bundling up of useless phrases, no filling in with pages of slosh' (*Egoist* IV, p. 22). While admitting it is very different, he finds it easiest to

compare it with *L'Education Sentimental*, a book in which Flaubert describes the Parisians more as they are than how they would like to be perceived, in a way similar to Joyce with Dublin and its inhabitants. Pound, then, uses the review for his own purposes, advocating the need for 'unexaggerated, realistic fiction', in order to expound his political views on the state of Europe, and Germany in particular.

Later, in June 1917, a list of some contrasting reviews of *Portrait* was published under the title, 'James Joyce and his Critics, Some Classified Comments'. Pound had dramatically put conflicting opinions together, which were later to constitute the preface to *Portrait* when it appeared in book form. On the point of beauty, for example, the *New York Globe* reports that 'there is much in the book to offend a good many varieties of readers, and little compensating beauty', while *New Witness* states that 'the most obvious thing about the book is its beauty' (*Egoist* IV, p. 74).

In February 1918 another article, again positive, appeared in *The Egoist*. The extract, from Diego Angeli's review in the Italian publication *Il Marzocco* of August 1917, was as complimentary as any of Pound's:

An Irishman, he has found in himself the strength to proclaim himself a citizen of a wider world; a catholic, he has had the courage to cast his religion from him and to proclaim himself an atheist; and a writer, inheriting the most traditionalist of all European literatures, he has found a way to break free from the tradition of the old English novel and to adopt a new style consonant with a new conception.

(*Egoist* V, p. 30)

Joyce was fortunate to fall into the hands of Pound and Weaver because, in them, he found allies in a fiercely competitive sub-field. His first book was published in a magazine, and by its press, which welcomed new, experimental and challenging work. In a field of conflicts he experienced the 'solidarity within the community of rebels and libertarians' without becoming entangled in their

individual disputes amongst each other.⁶¹ He was given consecration in the extreme position of the field of restricted production, but belonged to no movement. The Imagists and Vorticists tried to lay claim to him, but could not. The reason for this was that within this conflict Joyce stood out as an individual and if he was anything, James Joyce was a Joycist.

Endnotes: Appendix

¹ *The Egoist*, 1 (1914), p. 287. Further references to this periodical are given after quotations in the text marked, *Egoist* followed by the appropriate volume number: II (1915); IV (1917); V (1918).

² The first instalment appeared before the public in the third number of *The Egoist*, published on the 2 February 1914. The magazine was issued twice a month throughout 1914, however *Portrait* was absent from 15 September until the 16 November, inclusive. The problem was securing manuscripts during the war from Joyce, who was living in Austria at the time. When it recommenced on 1 December the editor noted that by 'the kind help of an intermediary in Switzerland we have succeeded in getting Mr. Joyce's manuscript through from Austria. The story will, therefore, now be continued without interruption', *Egoist* I, p. 439. Ellmann suggests that the serial break after the end of Chapter 3 had little to do with the outbreak of war, but more to do with the fact that Joyce had not actually written Chapter 4 and 5 yet, Richard Ellmann, *James Joyce* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1959), p. 364. From 1915, the magazine due to its small readership reduced production to once a month and so the final instalment was published on 1 September 1915. The only other interruption in the serial was the May edition in 1915, which was the issue devoted to Imagism.

³ Forrest Read, ed., *Pound/Joyce: The Letters of Ezra Pound to James Joyce, with Pound's Essays on Joyce* (London: Faber and Faber, 1967), p. 18.

⁴ Read, p. 19. The letters give the impression that Pound had more of a hand in the magazine than he actually did.

⁵ Read, p. 18.

⁶ Read, p. 39.

⁷ Renato Poggioli, *The Theory of the Avant-Garde*, trans. by Gerald Fitzgerald (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1968), p. 23.

⁸ Poggioli, p. 22.

⁹ Because these little magazines were all united in their opposition to the sub-field of large-scale production, it was not unusual to see mutual promotion within their pages. In the June issue of *The Egoist* in 1915 Richard Aldington published a favourable review of a new and radical magazine called *Loose Leaves* which comprised of only two pages. It declared a war on the commercial system applied to fine arts and the editor was highly praised for his actions: 'Mr. Storer's principle is excellent; he is quite independent of the caprices of vulgar journalists and a mythical "public"; he can write what he pleases without having to consider his audience. It is the principle upon which the arts rest', *Egoist* II, p. 98.

¹⁰ Iris Barry, *The Bookman*, 72 (1931), p. 167, cited in Jane Lidderdale and Mary Nicholson, *Dear Miss Weaver: Harriet Shaw Weaver, 1876-1961* (London: Faber and Faber, 1970), p. 131.

¹¹ *The New Freewoman*, 1 (1913), p. 244. Bridget Fowler takes a far more sinister view of Pound's motivations. She suggests that Pound's wish for titular change demonstrated 'the clearest strategic practice towards women' and 'symbolically cleansed the paper of its feminism', *Pierre Bourdieu and Cultural Theory: Critical Investigations*, (London: SAGE Publications, 1997), p. 141.

¹² It was not until June 1916 that Harriet Shaw Weaver decided it was time to change the company's name from The New Freewoman Limited to The Egoist Limited thus 'securing an acceptable imprint in England for Mr Joyce's books', Lidderdale, p. 123.

¹³ Lidderdale, pp. 99-100 & p. 121.

¹⁴ Lidderdale, p. 84.

¹⁵ Louis K. MacKendrick also describes it as 'probably the most advanced literary

journal of its time in England', T. S. Eliot and the *Egoist*: The Critical Presentation', *The Dalhousie Review*, 55 (1975), 140-154 (p. 141).

¹⁶ Randal Johnson's introduction to *Field*, 1-25 (p. 16).

¹⁷ Terms used by Poggioli, p. 114.

¹⁸ Raymond Williams, *The Politics of Modernism Against the New Conformists*, ed. by Tony Pinkney (London: Verso, 1989), p. 51. Williams makes a useful distinction between Modernism and the avant-garde: 'Modernism had proposed a new kind of art for a new kind of social and perceptual world. The avant-garde, aggressive from the beginning, saw itself as the breakthrough to the future'.

¹⁹ Poggioli, p. 27.

²⁰ See Poggioli, pp. 25-30.

²¹ William C. Wees, *Vorticism and the English Avant-Garde* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1972), p. 40.

²² Poggioli, p. 22.

²³ Lidderdale and Nicholson, p. 66.

²⁴ Ellmann, p. 361.

²⁵ Louis K. MacKendrick, 'The New Freewoman: A Short Story of Literary Journalism', *English Literature in Transition*, 15 (1972), 180-188 (p. 182).

²⁶ MacKendrick, (1975), p. 141.

²⁷ Peter Jones's introduction to *Imagist Poetry* (London: Penguin, 1972), 13-43 (p.17).

²⁸ These are reprinted in the appendix of Jones, *Imagist Poetry*, p. 129-34. *Poetry* was one of the other little magazines which received a favourable review in *The Egoist* I, p. 215.

²⁹ H. D.'s 'Oread' appeared in the first February issue of 1914, and was followed in the next year and a half by selections from John Gould Fletcher, Amy Lowell, Marianne Moore, and Richard Aldington.

³⁰ Five of the seven aspects he mentions are easily recognisable as Imagist preoccupations: direct treatment of the subject; as few adjectives as possible; a hardness; individuality of rhythm; the exact word. Number five is listed as, 'A whole series of don'ts [. . .] which are boresome to anyone except those writing poetry' and number seven as, 'I know there are a lot more but I can't remember them now', *Egoist* I, p.202.

³¹ Charles Ashleigh, 'Des Imagistes', *The Little Review*, (1914), p. 15, cited in Jones, *Imagist Poetry*, p. 19. The other four were John Cournos, Ford Madox Heuffer, Allen Upward and Skipworth Cannell.

³² J. B. Harmer, *Victory in Limbo: Imagism, 1908-1917* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1975), p. 38.

³³ Read, p. 32, an extract taken from Ezra Pound, 'The Non-Existence of Ireland', in *The New Age*, 16 (1915), p. 452.

³⁴ The reviews include Flint on H.D., Fletcher on Lowell and Aldington on Flint.

³⁵ Andrew Thacker has found many 'connections with the theories of the Imagist group' within the work of Marsden, which go some way to heal the schism which Alvin Sullivan suggests existed in the pages of *The Egoist* between aesthetic experimentalism and Marsden's ethical preoccupations. Andrew Thacker, 'Dora Marsden and *The Egoist*: "Our War is With Words"', *English Literature in Transition*, 36 (1993), 179-196 (p. 180); Alvin Sullivan, *British Literary Magazines: The Modern Age, 1914-1984* (London: Greenwood, 1986), p. 144.

³⁶ This article prompted an exchange of views in the correspondence columns of the magazine, one written by Gaudier-Brzeska, himself. In his letter he explains that 'the modern sculptor is a man who works with instinct as his inspiring force. His work is emotional. The shape of a leg, or the curve of an eyebrow, etc., etc., have to him no significance whatsoever', *The Egoist* I, p. 118.

³⁷ John Rothenstein, *Modern English Painters: Lewis to Moore* (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1956), p. 135.

³⁸ Reed Way Dasenbrock, *The Literary Vorticism of Ezra Pound & Wyndham Lewis* (London: John Hopkins, 1985), p. 14.

³⁹ Wees, p. 165.

⁴⁰ For the full list see Wees, pp. 217-227. See also Chapter 10 ' "Blast": The Manifesto', for a more detailed account of what the Vorticists hoped to achieve, pp. 165-180.

⁴¹ Harmer, p. 180.

⁴² Gaudier-Brzeska's second obituary appears in the same issue as the last serial instalment of *Portrait* which was to be succeeded by Wyndham Lewis's *Tarr*.

⁴³ Zbigniew Folejewski, *Futurism and its Place in the Development of Modern Poetry: A Comparative Study and Anthology* (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1980), p. 21. See also p. 22 for the full manifesto.

⁴⁴ Folejewski, p. 23.

⁴⁵ Folejewski suggests that Vorticism was actually a bridging of the gap between Imagism and Futurism, p. 119.

⁴⁶ Wees, p. 113.

⁴⁷ Letter to Harriet Shaw Weaver, dated 8 November 1916 in Stuart Gilbert, ed., *Letters of James Joyce* (London: Faber and Faber, [1957]), p. 99.

⁴⁸ For more detailed accounts of these awards see Lidderdale, pp. 134-135 & 157 and Ellmann: Royal Literary Fund, pp. 402-403; Civil List, pp. 418-419.

⁴⁹ Ellmann, p. 365, 'to know that he was being read was more important to Joyce than he would have admitted. It was not that he demanded praise alone; he enjoyed dispraise too, and in fact all attention'.

⁵⁰ That is, Joyce had the financial backing which allowed him to appear uninterested in monetary rewards for his work.

⁵¹ Lidderdale, p. 83.

⁵² Ellmann, p. 363.

⁵³ Lidderdale, p. 93. The details of the serial changes are found on pp. 92, 99 & 103.

⁵⁴ Read, p. 77.

⁵⁵ John F. Harris, 'A Note on James Joyce', *To-Day*, 3 (1918) p. 88, cited in, Robert H. Deming, *James Joyce: The Critical Heritage, 1902-1927*, 2 vols. (London: Routledge Kegan and Paul, 1970), I, p. 121.

⁵⁶ At this time printers as well as publishers were liable to prosecution as a result of any text they produced.

⁵⁷ D. D. Paige, ed., *The Letters of Ezra Pound, 1907-1941* (London: Faber and Faber, 1951), p. 151.

⁵⁸ Reproduced in Read, pp. 22-24.

⁵⁹ Ellmann, p. 363.

⁶⁰ Ellmann, p. 363.

⁶¹ Poggioli, p. 31.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscripts

National Library of Scotland Mf-sec. Mss. 965, Working Neg. MS 6652, Barrie's Notes on Prof. David Masson's lectures on rhetoric, 31 October- 29 November 1881

Beinecke Library, Barrie Collection, A/3.

Books

Primary

Arnold, Matthew, 'Up to Easter', in *The Complete Prose Works of Matthew Arnold, The Last Word*, ed. by R. H. Super, 11 vols. (Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1960-1977) XI, 190-209

Bainton, George, ed., *The Art of Authorship* (London: James, 1890)

J. M. Barrie, *Sentimental Tommy: The Story of his Boyhood*, with illustrations by William Hatherell (New York: Charles Scribner's Son, 1896)

An Edinburgh Eleven, uniform edn. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1926)

Sentimental Tommy: The Story of his Boyhood, uniform edn. (London: Cassell, [1926(?)])

Tommy and Grizel, uniform edn. (London: Cassell, [1928(?)])

Auld Licht Idylls, uniform edn. (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1930)

When A Man's Single, uniform edn. (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1930)

An Edinburgh Eleven, uniform edn. (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1931)

Window in Thrums, uniform edn. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1931)

The Greenwood Hat being a Memoir of James Anon, 1885-1887 (London: Peter Davies, 1937)

McConnachie and J. M. B.: Speeches by J. M. Barrie (London: Peter Davies, 1938)

Besant, Walter, *The Pen and the Book* (London: Thomas Burleigh, 1899)

The Art of Fiction, new edn. (London: Chatto & Windus, 1902)

Autobiography of Sir Walter Besant, pref. note by S. Squire Sprigge (London: Hutchinson, 1902)

Essays and Historiettes (London: Chatto & Windus, 1903)

Bennett, Arnold, *The Author's Craft* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1914)

Birrell, Augustine, *Life of Charlotte Brontë*, Great Writers Series (London: Walter Scott, 1887)

- Blunt, Reginald, *The Carlyles' Chelsea Home, being some account of No. 5, Cheyne Row* (London: George Bell, 1895)
- Carlyle, Thomas, *On Heroes, Hero-Worship and the Heroic in History* [1840] (London: Chapman and Hall, 1872)
Critical and Miscellaneous Essays, centenary edn., 5 vols. (London: Chapman and Hall: London, 1899), III
- Colvin, Sidney ed., *The Letters of Robert Louis Stevenson to his Family and Friends*, 2 vols. (London: Methuen, 1899)
- Doyle, Arthur Conan, *The White Company* (London: Smith, Elder, 1891)
- Dictionary of National Biography*, 1885-1900
- Firth, C. H., 'Memoir of Sir Sidney Lee', in *Dictionary of National Biography*, 1912-21 (London: Oxford University Press, 1927)
- Garnett, Richard, LL.D., *Life of Carlyle*, Great Writers Series (London: Walter Scott, 1895)
- Gaskell, Elizabeth, *The Life of Charlotte Brontë*, ed. by Alan Shelston (London: Penguin, 1985)
- Gissing, George, *New Grub Street: A Novel* (London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1891)
Charles Dickens, A Critical Study (London: Blackie & Son, 1929)
Selections Autobiographical and Imaginative from the Works of George Gissing, biographical and critical notes by A. C. Gissing, intro. by Virginia Woolf (London: Jonathon Cape, 1929)
George Gissing's Commonplace Book, ed. by Jacob Korg (New York: New York Public Library, 1962)
Thyrza: A Tale, ed. by Jacob Korg (Sussex: Harvester, 1974)
London and the Life of Literature in Late Victorian England: The Diary of George Gissing, ed. by Pierre Coustillas (Sussex: Harvester, 1978)
New Grub Street, ed. by Bernard Bergonzi (London: Penguin, 1985)
The Collected Letters of George Gissing, ed. by Paul F. Mattheissen, Arthur C. Young, Pierre Coustillas, 9 vols. (Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1990-1997)
- Harland, Marion, *Charlotte Brontë at Home* (London: G. P. Putnam Son's, 1899)
Where Ghosts Walk The Haunts of Familiar Characters in History and Literature (London: G. P. Putnam Son's, 1910)
- Hubbard, Elbert, *Little Journeys to the Homes of English Authors* (New York: Roycrofters, 1900)
Little Journeys to the Homes of Famous Women (London: G. P. Putnam Son's, 1897)

Hutton, Richard H., *Sir Walter Scott*, English Men of Letters Series, ed. by John Morley (London: Macmillan, 1878)

James, Henry, Jnr., *Hawthorne*, English Men of Letters Series, ed. by John Morley (London: Macmillan, 1879)

James, Henry, *The House of Fiction, Essays on the Novel*, ed. by Leon Edel (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1957)

Henry James: Representative Selections, intro. by Lyon, N. Richardson (London: University of Illinois Press, 1966)

Henry James Letters, ed. by Leon Edel, 1883-1895, 4 vols. (London: Macmillan, 1974-84)

The Critical Muse: Selected Literary Criticism, ed. by Roger Gard (London: Penguin, 1987)

Literary Criticism, French Writers, Other European Writers, The Prefaces to the New York Edition, ed. by Leon Edel (New York: Library of America, 1984)

The Figure in the Carpet and Other Stories, ed. by Frank Kermode (London: Penguin, 1986)

Jerome, K. Jerome, ed., *My First Book by Twenty-Two Authors* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1894)

Joyce, James, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, ed. by Seamus Deane (London: Penguin, 1992)

Stephen Hero: Part of the First Draft of 'A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man,' ed. by Theodore Spencer, rev. edn., with additions by John J. Slocum and Herbert Cahoon (London: Jonathon Cape, 1956)

Lee, Sidney, 'Memoir to George Smith', in *Dictionary of National Biography*, 22 (Supplement) (London: Smith, Elder, 1909)

Postscript to the 'Statistical Account' of the *Dictionary of National Biography*, 1 (London: Smith, Elder, 1908)

Marzials, Frank T., *Life of Dickens*, Great Writers Series (London: Walter Scott, 1887)

Minto, William, *Daniel Defoe*, English Men of Letters Series, ed. by John Morley (London: Macmillan, 1879)

Russell, Percy, *The Literary Manual, or A Complete Guide to Authorship* (London: London Literary Society, 1886)

A Guide to British and American Novels (London: Digby, Long, 1894)

Sprigge, S. Squire, *The Methods of Publishing* (London: Henry Glaisner, 1890)

- Stevenson, Robert Louis, *Selected Short Stories of R. L. Stevenson*, ed. by Ian Campbell (Edinburgh: Ramsay Head Press, 1980)
Essays in the Art of Writing (London: Chatto & Windus, 1905)
Essays: Literary and Critical (London: Heinemann, (19??))
- Traill, H. D., *Sterne*, English Men of Letters Series, ed. by John Morley (London: Macmillan, 1882)
- Trollope, Anthony, *Thackeray*, English Men of Letters Series, ed. by John Morley (London: Macmillan, 1879)
The Way We Live Now, (London: Chatto & Windus, 1907)
An Autobiography, ed. by David Skilton (London: Penguin, 1996)
- Ward, Adolphus William, *Dickens*, English Men of Letters Series, ed. by John Morley (London: Macmillan, 1882)
- Wells, H. G., *Experiment in Autobiography, Discoveries and Conclusion of a Very Ordinary Brain (Since 1866)*, 2 vols. (London: Victor Gollancz, 1934)
- Wilde, Oscar, *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, ed. by Isobel Murray (London: Oxford University Press, 1974)
- Woolf, Virginia, *Collected Essays by Virginia Woolf*, ed. by Leonard Woolf, 4 vols. (London: Hogarth, 1966-1967)
The Common Reader, ed. by Andrew McNeillie, 1st Series (London: Hogarth, 1984)

Secondary

- Adorno, Theodor, W., *The Culture Industry Selected Essays on Mass Culture*, ed. by J. M. Bernstein (London: Routledge, 1991)
- Adorno, Theodor & Max Horkheimer, *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, trans. by John Cumming (London: Verso, 1979)
- Altick, Richard D., *Lives and Letters: A History of Literary Biography in England and America* (New York: Albert A. Knopf, 1965)
Writers, Readers, and Occasions, Selected Essays on Victorian Literature and Life (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1989)
- Anesko, Michael, *'Friction with the Market': Henry James and the Profession of Authorship* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986)
- Asquith, Cynthia, *Portrait of Barrie* (London: James Barrie, 1954)
- Attridge, Derek, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to James Joyce* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990)

- Baldick, Chris, *The Social Mission of English Criticism, 1848-1932* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983)
- Balfour, Graham, *The Life of Robert Louis Stevenson*, 2 vols., (London: Methuen, 1901)
- Barthes, Roland, *Image, Music, Text*, trans. by Stephen Heath (London: Fontana, 1977)
- Bell, Bill, 'Fiction in the Marketplace: Towards a Study of the Victorian Novel', in *Serials and Their Readers, 1620-1914*, ed. by Robin Myers and Michael Harris (Winchester: St. Paul's Bibliographies, 1993), 125-44
- Bell, Ian, *Robert Louis Stevenson: Dreams of Exile* (Edinburgh: Mainstream, 1992)
- Bergonzi, Bernard, *The Turn of the Century: Essays on Victorian and Modern English Literature* (London: Macmillan, 1973)
- Bishop, Edward, *A Virginia Woolf Chronology* (London: Macmillan, 1989)
- Blake, George, *Barrie and the Kailyard School* (London: Arthur Baker, 1951)
- Bonham-Carter, Victor, *Authors by Profession*, 2 vols. (London: Society of Authors, 1978-1984) I
- Booth, Bradford A., & Ernest Meheew, eds., *The Letters of Robert Louis Stevenson*, 7 vols. (London: Yale University Press, 1994-5), VII (1995)
- Bourdieu, Pierre, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, trans. by Richard Nice (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1986)
Language and Symbolic Power, ed. by John B. Thompson, trans. by Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson (Cambridge: Polity, 1991)
The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature, ed. by Randal Johnson (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1993)
Sociology in Question (London: SAGE Publications, 1993)
The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field, trans. by Susan Emanuel (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996)
- Bourdieu, Pierre and James S. Coleman, eds., *Social Theory for a Changing Society* (Oxford: Westview Press, 1991)
- Bourdieu, Pierre, et al, *Academic Discourse: Linguistic Misunderstanding and Professorial Power*, trans. Richard Teese (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994)
- Brake, Laurel, *Subjugated Knowledges: Journalism, Gender and Literature in the Nineteenth Century* (London: Macmillan, 1994)

- Brittain, F., *Arthur Quiller-Couch: A Biographical Study of Q* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1947)
- Calder, Jenni, *Stevenson and Victorian Scotland* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1981)
- Campbell, Ian, *Kailyard* (Edinburgh: Ramsay Head, 1981)
- Carr, John Dickson, *The Life of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle* (London: John Murray, 1949)
- Chalmers, Patrick, *The Barrie Inspiration* (London: Peter Davies, 1938)
- Cockshut, A. O. J., *Anthony Trollope* (London: Methuen, 1955)
- Collie, Michael, *George Gissing: A Biography* (Folkestone: Dawson, 1977),
- Connolly, Thomas, *Joyce's Portrait: Criticisms and Critiques* (London: Peter Owen, 1964)
- Cortissoz, Royal, 'Charles Scribner', in *Dictionary of American Biography*, ed. by Dumas Malone, 20 vols. (London: Oxford University Press 1928-1936) XVI (1935), 515-17
- Coustillas, Pierre, ed., *Collected Articles on George Gissing* (London: Frank Cass, 1967)
 ed., *George Gissing: Essays & Fiction* (London: John Hopkins Press, 1970)
 ed., *London and the Life of Literature in Late Victorian England: The Diary of George Gissing, Novelist* (Sussex: Harvester Press, 1978)
- Coustillas, Pierre & Colin Partridge, *Gissing: The Critical Heritage* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972)
- Coustillas, Pierre, Paul F. Mattheisen & Arthur C. Young, eds. *The Collected Letters of George Gissing*, 9 vols. (Athens: Ohio University Press, 1990-1997)
- Craig, Cairns, *Yeats, Eliot, Pound and the Politics of Poetry: Richest to the Richest* (London: Croom Helm, [1982])
- Cross, Nigel, *The Common Writer: Life in Nineteenth Century Grub Street* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985)
- Dasenbrock, Reed Way, *The Literary Vorticism of Ezra Pound & Wyndham Lewis: Towards the Condition of Painting* (London: John Hopkins, 1985)
- Daugherty, Sarah B., *The Literary Criticism of Henry James* (Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1981)

Dekker, George, 'James and Stevenson: The Mixed Current of Realism and Romance', in *Critical Reconstructions: The Relationship of Fiction and Life*, ed. by Robert M. Polhemus & Roger B. Henkle (California: Stanford University Press, 1994), 127-49.

Deming, Robert H., ed., *James Joyce. The Critical Heritage, 1902-1927*, 2 vols. (London: Routledge Kegan and Paul, 1970) I

Demetz, Peter, *Italian Futurism and the German Literary Avant-Garde*, 1986 Bithell Memorial Lecture (London: Institute of Germanic Studies, University of London, 1987)

Dooley, Allan C., *Author and Printer in Victorian England* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1992)

Edel, Leon, *Henry James: The Middle Years 1884-1894* (London: Rupert-Hart Davis, 1963)

Henry James: The Treacherous Years 1895-1901 (London: Rupert-Hart Davis, 1969)

Edel, Leon & Dan H. Lawrence, ed., *A Bibliography of Henry James*, 3rd edn. (London: Clarendon, 1982)

Edwards, Owen Dudley, *The Quest for Sherlock Holmes: A Biographical Study of Arthur Conan Doyle* (London: Macmillan, 1983)

Eiser, Wolfgang, *Walter Pater: The Aesthetic Movement* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987)

Ellmann, Richard, *James Joyce* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1959) ed., *Letters of James Joyce*, 3 vols. (London: Faber and Faber, ([1957]-1966), II (1966). First volume edited as *Letters* by Stuart Gilbert.

Henry James Among the Aesthetes (London: Oxford University Press, 1983)

Feltes, N. N., *Modes of Production of Victorian Novels* (London: University of Chicago Press, 1986)

Literary Capital and the Late Victorian Novel (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1993)

Fenwick, Gillian, *The Contributors' Index to the Dictionary of National Biography, 1885-1901* (Hampshire: St. Paul's Bibliographies, 1989)

Fogel, Daniel Mark, *A Companion to Henry James Studies* (London: Greenwood, 1993)

Folejewski, Zbigniew, *Futurism and its Place in the Development of Modern Poetry: A Comparative Study and Anthology* (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1980)

- Foucault, Michel, *The Foucault Reader*, ed. by Paul Rabinow (London: Penguin, 1984)
- Fowler, Bridget, *Pierre Bourdieu and Cultural Theory: Critical Investigations* (London: SAGE Publications, 1997)
- Garland, Herbert, *A Bibliography of the Writing of Sir James Matthew Barrie, Bart., O.M.*, (London: The Bookman's Journal, 1928)
- Gaunt, William, *The Aesthetic Adventure* (London: Jonathon Cape, 1945)
- Geduld, Harry M., *Sir James Barrie* (New York: Twayne, 1971)
- Genette, Gerard, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, trans. by Jane E. Lewin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997)
- Gettman, Royal A., ed., *George Gissing and H. G. Wells, Their Friendship and Correspondence* (London: Rupert Hart Davies, 1961)
- Gilbert, Stuart, ed., *Letters of James Joyce* (London: Faber and Faber, [1957])
- Goode, John, 'The Art of Fiction: Walter Besant and Henry James', in *Tradition and Tolerance in Nineteenth-Century Fiction, Critical Essays on some English and American Novels*, ed. by David Howard, John Lucas & John Goode (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966), 207-41
George Gissing: Ideology and Fiction (London: Vision Press, 1978)
- Griest, Guinevere, *Mudie's Circulating Library* (Devon: David and Charles, 1970)
- Grylls, David, *The Paradox of Gissing* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1986),
- Gross, John, *The Rise and Fall of the English Man of Letters: Aspects of English Literary Life since 1800* (London: Penguin, 1991)
- Halperin, John, *Gissing, A Life in Books* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982)
- Harmer, J. B., *Victory in Limbo: Imagism, 1908-1917* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1975)
- Hough, Graham, *The Last Romantics* (London: Gerald Duckworth, 1949)
- Houghton, Walter E., *The Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals, 1824-1900*, 5 vols. (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966-1989)
- Howells, Mildred, ed., *Life in Letters of William Dean Howells*, 2 vols. (New York: Doubleday, Doran & Co., 1928)
- Hughes, Linda K. & Michael Lund, *The Victorian Serial* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1991)

Jack, R. D. S., *The Road to the Never Land* (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1991)

Jackson, Holbrook, *The Eighteen Nineties: A Review of Art and Ideas at the Close of the Nineteenth Century* (London: Harvester Press, 1976)

Jacobson, Marcia, *Henry James and the Mass Market* (Alabama: University of Alabama, 1983)

James, W. Bevan, *Elbert Hubbard Master Man* (London: C. W. Daniel, 1917)

Jenkins, Richard, *Pierre Bourdieu* (London: Routledge, 1992)

Jones, Peter, ed., *Imagist Poetry* (London: Penguin, 1972)

Jones, Vivien, *James the Critic* (London: Macmillan, 1995)

Keating, Peter, *The Haunted Study: A Social History of the English Novel, 1875-1914* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1989)

Keating, P. J., *George Gissing: New Grub Street*, gen. ed. David Daiches, *Studies in English Literature*, 33 (London: Edward Arnold, 1968)

Kenner, Hugh, *The Pound Era* (London: Faber and Faber, 1972)

Joyce's Voices (London: Faber and Faber, 1978)

Kermode, Frank, *The Sense of an Ending* (London: Oxford University Press, 1966)

Kershner, R. B., ed., *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man: James Joyce* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993)

Knowles, Thomas, D., *Ideology, Art and Commerce: Aspects of Literary Sociology in the Late Victorian Scottish Kailyard*, *Gothenburg Studies in English*, 54 (Gothenburg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis, 1983)

Korg, Jacob, *George Gissing: A Critical Biography* (London: Methuen, 1963)

Korg, Jacob & Cynthia, *Gissing on Fiction* (London: Enitharmon, 1978)

Ledger, Sally and Scott MacCracken eds. *Cultural Politics at the Fin de Siècle* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995)

Lennon, Peter, *Foreign Correspondent: Paris in the Sixties* (London: Picador, 1994)

Lidderdale, Jane and Mary Nicholson, *Dear Miss Weaver: Harriet Shaw Weaver, 1876-1961* (London: Faber and Faber, 1970)

McDonald, Peter D., *British Literary Culture and Publishing Practice, 1880-1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997)

McKail, Denis, *The Story of J. M. B.: A Biography* (London: Peter Davies, 1941)

- McLeish, Kenneth, 'The Rippingest Yarn of All', in *J. R. R. Tolkien: This Far Land*, ed. by Robert Giddings (London: Vision Press, 1983), 125-36
- McMurtry, Jo., *English Language, English Literature: The Creation of an Academic Discipline* (London: Mansell, 1985)
- Macmillan, Daniel, *A Bibliographical Catalogue of Macmillan and Co.'s Publications from 1843 to 1889* (London: Macmillan, 1891)
- Maddox, Brenda, *Nora: A Biography of Nora Joyce* (London: Minerva, 1988)
- Maitland, Frederic William, *The Life and Letters of Leslie Stephen* (London: Duckworth, 1906)
- Margolis, Anne T., *Henry James and the Problem of Audience: An International Act*, *Studies in Modern Literature*, 49 (Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Research Press, 1985)
- Markgraf, Carl, *J. M. Barrie: An Annotated Secondary Bibliography*, *British Authors Series*, 4 (Greensboro, NC: ELT Press, 1989)
- Matthiessen, F. O. & Kenneth B. Murdock, eds., *The Notebooks of Henry James* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1947)
- Mason, Ellsworth & Richard Ellmann, eds. *The Critical Writings of James Joyce* (London: Faber and Faber, 1959)
- Melville, Lewis, *Victorian Novelists* (London: Constable, 1906)
- Meynell, Viola, *Letters of J. M. Barrie* (London: Peter Davies, 1942)
- Mix, Katherine Lyon, *A Study in Yellow: The Yellow Book and its Contributors* (London: Constable, 1960)
- Moore, Rayburn S., ed., *The Correspondence of Henry James and the House of Macmillan, 1877-1914, 'All The Links in the Chain'* (London: Macmillan, 1993)
- Morgan, Charles, *The House of Macmillan (1843-1943)* (London: Macmillan, 1943)
- Moult, Thomas, *Barrie: A Critical Estimate* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1928)
- Nadel, Ira Bruce, *Biography Fiction, Fact and Form* (London: Macmillan, 1984)
- Nalbantian, Suzanne, *Aesthetic Autobiography: From Life to Art in Marcel Proust, James Joyce, Virginia Woolf and Anaïs Nin* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994)
- Nehamas, Alexander, 'Writer, Text, Work, Author', in *Literature and the Question of Philosophy*, ed. by Anthony J. Cascardi (London: John Hopkins, 1987) 267-291

- Nelson, James G., *Elkin Matthews: Publisher to Yeats, Joyce, Pound* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989)
- Ormond, Leonee, *J. M. Barrie* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1987)
- Paige, D. D., ed., *The Letters of Ezra Pound 1907-1941* (London: Faber and Faber, 1951)
- Pike, Christopher, ed., *The Futurists, the Formalists and the Marxist Critique* (London: Ink Links, 1979)
- Pinion, F. B., *A Thomas Hardy Dictionary* (London: Macmillan, 1989)
A Tennyson Chronology (London: Macmillan, 1990)
- Pittock, Murray G. H., *Spectrum of Decadence: The Literature of the 1890s* (London: Routledge, 1993)
- Poggioli, Renato, *The Theory of the Avant-Garde*, trans. by Gerald Fitzgerald (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1968)
- Pollard, Arthur, *Mrs Gaskell: Novelist and Biographer* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1965)
- Potts, Willard, ed., *Portrait of the Artist in Exile: Recollections of James Joyce by Europeans* (London: University of Washington Press, 1979)
- Read, Forrest, ed., *Pound/Joyce: The Letters of Ezra Pound to James Joyce, with Pound's Essays on Joyce* (London: Faber and Faber, 1967)
- Rose, W. K., *The Letters of Wyndham Lewis* (London: Methuen, 1963)
- Rothenstein, John, *Modern English Painters: Lewis to Moore* (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1956)
- Ruddick, William, 'Scott, Stevenson and Barrie: Edwin Muir's Rejection of Prose Romance', in *Edwin Muir Centenary Assessment*, ed. by C. J. M. MacLachlan and D. S. Robb (Aberdeen: Association for Scottish Studies, 1990), 95-101
- Salmon, Richard, *Henry James and the Culture of Publicity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997)
- Selig, Robert L., *George Gissing*, Twayne's English Authors Series, 346 (Boston: Twayne, 1983)
- Shattock, Joanne & Michael Wolff, *The Victorian Periodical Press: Samplings and Soundings* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1982)
- Shepard, Alan, 'From Aristotle to Keats: Stephen's Search for "The Good Life" in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*', *English Studies*, 74 (1993), 105-12

- Sjoholm, Christina, *'The Vice of Wedlock': The Theme of Marriage in George Gissing's Novels* (Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, 1994)
- Smith, Janet Adam, ed., *Henry James and Robert Louis Stevenson: A Record of Friendship and Criticism* (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1948)
- Stetz, Margaret, Diane, 'New Grub Street and the Woman Writer of the 1890s', in *Transforming Genres: New Approaches to British Fiction in the 1890s*, ed. by Nikki Lee Manos and Meri-Jane Rochelson, (London: Macmillan, 1994), 21-45
- Stevenson, R. W., *Modernist Fiction: An Introduction* (London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1992)
- Stewart, James D., Muriel C. Hammond & Erwin Saenger eds., *British Union Catalogue of Periodicals*, 4 vols. (London: Butterworths Scientific Publications, 1955-8)
- Stokes, John, *In the Nineties* (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1989)
- Sullivan, Alvin, *British Literary Magazines: The Romantic Age, 1789-1836* (London: Greenwood, 1983)
British Literary Magazines: The Victorian and Edwardian Age, 1837-1913 (London: Greenwood, 1984)
British Literary Magazines: The Modern Age, 1914-1984 (London: Greenwood, 1986)
- Sutherland, J. A., *Victorian Novelists and Publishers* (London: Athlone Press, 1976)
- Swinnerton, Frank, *The Bookman's London* (London: John Baker, 1969)
- Tebbel, John, *A History of Book Publishing in the United States: The Creation of an Industry, 1630-1865*, 4 vols. (London: R. R. Bowker, 1972-81), I
A History of Book Publishing in the United States: The Expansion of an Industry 1865-1919, 4 vols. (London: R. R. Bowker, 1972-81), II (1975)
- Thompson, John B., *Studies in the Theory of Ideology* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1984)
- Thomas, Edward, *A Literary Pilgrim in England* (London: Oxford University Press, 1980)
A Literary Pilgrim: An Illustrated Guide to Britain's Literary Heritage, ed. by Michael Justin Davies (Exeter: Webb & Bower, 1985)
- Tindall, Gillian, *The Born Exile: George Gissing* (London: Temple Smith, 1974)
- Tindall, William York, *A Reader's Guide to James Joyce* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1959)

Wees, William C., *Vorticism and the English Avant-Garde* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1972)

West, Anthony, *H. G. Wells: Aspects of Life* (London: Hutchinson, 1984)

Williams, Raymond, *Culture and Society, 1780-1950* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1958)

The Long Revolution (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1965)

The Politics of Modernism Against the New Conformists, ed. by Tony Pinkney (London: Verso, 1989)

Willison, Ian, Warwick Gould & Warren Chernaik, eds., *Modernist Writers and the Marketplace* (Macmillan: London, 1996)

Young, Arthur C., ed., *The Letters of George Gissing to Eduard Bertz, 1887-1903* (London: Constable, 1961)

Periodicals

Contemporary

The Academy, 50-60 (1896-1901)

The Author, 1-10 (1890-1899)

E. A. B, 'Mr. George Gissing. An Inquiry', *The Academy*, 57 (1899), 724-26

Barrie, J. M., 'Mr George Meredith's Novels', *Contemporary Review*, 54 (1888), 575-86

'Thomas Hardy: The Historian of Wessex', *Contemporary Review*, 56 (1889), 57-66

'Brought Back from Elysium', *Contemporary Review*, 57 (1890), 846-54

'Mr Baring-Gould's Novels', *Contemporary Review*, 57 (1890), 206-14

'Mr Kipling's Stories', *Contemporary Review*, 59 (1891), 364-372

'Ndintpile Pont', *The Bookman*, 1 (1892), 173-4

Besant, Walter, 'The Literary Agent', *The Nineteenth Century*, 38 (1895), 979-86

Blowitz, H. G. A. Oppen de, 'Journalism as a Profession', *The Contemporary Review*, 63 (1893), 37-46

[Christie, R. C.], 'The Dictionary of National Biography', *The Quarterly Review*, 164 (1887), 350-81

Deland, Margaret, 'A Menace to Literature', *The North American Review*, 158 (1894), 157-63

Dolman, Frederick, 'George Gissing's Novels', *National Review*, 30 (1897-8), 258-66

Douglas, Sir George, 'Mr. J. M. Barrie', *Good Words*, no vol. no. (1899), 200-203
The Egoist, 1-6 (1914-19)

Gorren, Aline, 'The Ethics of Modern Journalism', *Scribner's Magazine*, 19 (1896), 507-13

Harrison, Austin, 'George Gissing', *Nineteenth Century and After*, 60 (1906), 453-63

The Idler, 1-14 (1892-1899)

Lang, Andrew, 'Realism in Grub Street', *The Author*, 2 (1891), 43-4

Laurie, T. Werner, 'Author, Agent, and Publisher. By one of "the trade" ', *Nineteenth Century*, 38 (1895), 850-55

[Low, Walter], 'The Complete Leader-Writer (by Himself)', *Macmillan's Magazine*, 70 (1894), 359-64

[Meldrum, D. S.], 'A New Boy In Fiction', *Blackwood's Magazine*, 160 (1896), 800-13

Quiller-Couch, A. T., 'Mr. Barrie's "Sentimental Tommy" A Causerie', *The Contemporary Review*, 70 (1896), 652-62

Quilter, Harry, 'The Gospel of Intensity', *The Contemporary Review*, 67 (1895), 761-82

Scribner's Magazine, 19-20 (1896)

Sichel, Edith, 'Two Philanthropic Novelists: Mr. Walter Besant and Mr. George Gissing', *Murray's Magazine*, 3 (1888), 506-18

The Spectator, 66-77 (1891-6)

Stead, W. T., 'Government by Journalism', *The Contemporary Review*, 49 (1886), 653-74

'The Future of Journalism', *The Contemporary Review*, 50 (1886), 663-79

- Stephen, Leslie, 'Authors for Hire', *The Cornhill Magazine*, 43 (1881), 684-702
 'Ramble Among the Books II: Autobiography', *The Cornhill Magazine*, 43 (1881), 410-29
 'The Decay of Literature', *The Cornhill Magazine*, 46 (1882), 602-12
 'A New "Biographica Britannica" ', *The Athenæum*, no. 2878 (1882), 850
 'The Duties of Authors', *The National Review*, 23 (1894), 319-339

The Strand Magazine, 1-12 (1891-6)

Trollope, Anthony, 'On Anonymous Literature', *Fortnightly Review*, 1 (1865), 491-98

- Unsigned, 'The Dictionary of National Biography', *The Athenæum*, no. 3794 (1900), 45-46
 'Fiction in Light of Travel', *The Academy*, 60 (1901), 535-36
 'The Journalist in Fiction', *The Church Quarterly Review*, 36 (1893), 73-92
 'Mr. Gissing at Home', *The Academy*, 53 (1898), 258
 'Mr. Punch's Prize Novels', *Punch*, 99 (1890), 229
 'Our Library List : "New Grub Street" ', *Murray's Magazine*, 9 (1891), 855-6
 'Sentimental Tommy', *The Athenæum*, no. 3602 (1896), 635
 'Sentimental Tommy: The Story of His Boyhood', *The Academy*, 50 (1896), 385
 'Some Younger Reputations', *The Academy*, 52 (1897), 488-97
 'Two Writers', *The Academy*, 60 (1901), 515-6

Wells, H. G., 'The Novels of George Gissing', *The Contemporary Review*, 72 (1897), 192-201

The Yellow Book, 1-13, (1894-1897)

Later Articles

- Bell, Bill, 'Empty Spaces: A Visit to Cheyne Row', *The Carlyle Society Papers*, n.s. 5 (1991-2) [no page numbers]
 New Directions in Victorian Publishing History', *Victorian Literature and Culture*, 22 (1994), 347-54
- Boege, Fred W., 'Sir Walter Besant: Novelist (Part One)', *Nineteenth Century Fiction*, 10 (1955-6), 249-280
 'Sir Walter Besant: Novelist (Part Two)', *Nineteenth Century Fiction*, 11 (1956-7), 32-60
- Brake, Laurel, 'Problems in Victorian Biography: The DNB and the DNB "Walter Pater" ', *The Modern Language Review*, 70 (1975), 731-42

Brubaker, Rogers, 'Rethinking Classical Theory: The Sociological Vision of Pierre Bourdieu', *Theory and Society*, 14 (1985), 745-775

Buitenhuis, Peter, 'Henry James's *Art of Fiction* in its European Context', *Revue Française D'Etudes Américaines*, 8 (1983), 217-25

Colby, Robert A., 'Harnessing Pegasus: Walter Besant, *The Author* and the Profession of Authorship', *Victorian Periodicals Review*, 23 (1990), 111-20

DiMaggio, Paul, 'Review Essay: On Pierre Bourdieu', *American Journal of Sociology*, 84 (1978-9), 1460-74

Fenwick, Gillian, 'The *Athenæum* and the *Dictionary of National Biography*, 1885-1901', *Victorian Periodicals Review*, 23 (1990), 180-88

Hunter, Lynette, 'J. M. Barrie: The Rejection of Fantasy', *Scottish Literary Journal*, 5 (1978), 39-52

Jack, R. D. S., 'From Novel to Drama: J. M. Barrie's *Quality Street*', *Scottish Literary Journal*, 14 (1987), 48-61

Kijinski, John, L., 'John Morley's "English Men of Letters" Series and the Politics of Reading', *Victorian Studies*, 34 (1991), 205-225

Korsten, F. J. M., 'The "English Men of Letters" Series: A Monument of Late-Victorian Literary Criticism', *English Studies*, 73 (1992), 503-516

Lamarque, Peter, 'The Death of the Author: An Analytical Autopsy', *British Journal of Aesthetics*, 30 (1990), 319-331

MacKendrick, Louis, K., 'The *New Freewoman*: A Short Story of Literary Journalism', *English Literature in Transition, 1880-1929*, 15 (1972), 180-88
 'T. S. Eliot and the *Egoist*: The Critical Presentation', *The Dalhousie Review*, 55 (1975), 140-154

Nisbet, Molly, 'What Was an Author', *Yale French Studies*, 73 (1987), 229-257

Rogers, Pat, 'Diversions of the "DNB"', *Essays and Studies*, n. s. 37 (1984), 75-86

Salmon, Richard, 'Signs of Intimacy: The Literary Celebrity in the "Age of Interviewing"', *Victorian Literature and Culture*, 25, (1997) 159-77

Selig, Robert L., 'Biographical Decoding: Gissing's Life and Work', *Review*, 5 (1983) 203-10

Spilka, Mark, 'Henry James and Walter Besant: "The Art of Fiction" Controversy', *Novel*, 6 (1973) 101-19

Sulkunen, Pekka, 'Society Made Visible - on the Cultural Sociology of Pierre Bourdieu', *Acta Sociologica*, 25 (1982) 103-115

Sutherland, John, 'Victorian Novelists: A Survey', *Critical Quarterly*, 30 (1988), 50-61

Thacker, Andrew, 'Dora Marsden and *The Egoist*: "Our War is With Words" ', *English Literature in Transition, 1880-1929*, 36 (1993) 179-90

Wright, Allen, 'Kelvinside, Kirriemuir and the Kailyard', *Chapman*, 11 (1989) 134-37